THE
Review and Expositor

Vol. L JULY, 1953 No. 3

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION 275

THE GOSPEL AND THE PREACHER 279
By Harold C. Phillips

THE DIVINE ELECTION 298
By Julius R. Mantey

AUGUSTINE'S ACCOUNT OF THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF MORAL EVIL 309
By Guy H. Ranson

THE PLACE OF KNOWLEDGE IN CALVIN'S VIEW OF FAITH 323
By James M. Bulman

SCIENCE AND THE EARLIEST COMMANDMENT 330
By Carl Tabb Bahner

THAT TROUBLESOME 'ALMAH AND OTHER MATTERS 337
By William A. Irwin

BOOK REVIEWS 361

INDEX TO BOOKS REVIEWED 393

THE

Review and Expositor

A BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Edited by the Faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

EDITORIAL STAFF

DUKE K. McCALL	Editor-in-Chief
H. C. GOERNER	Managing Editor
TAYLOR C. SMITH	Book Review Editor
WM. H. MORTON	Business Manager

Correspondence: General address, The Review and Expositor, 2825 Lexington Road, Louisville 6, Ky. Concerning articles and editorial matters address the Managing Editor; concerning books and reviews, the Review Editor; concerning subscriptions and matters of business, the Business Manager.

Subscription Rates: $2.00 per year in advance; single copies, 60 cents. Sold in England by Kingsgate Press, 4 Southhampton Row, London; in Canada, by Baptist Book Rooms, Toronto.

Entered as second-class matter July 14, 1906, at the Post Office at Louisville, Ky., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 19, 1918.

Editorial Introduction

A highlight of the last session at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary was the Mullins Lectures on Preaching, delivered in March by Dr. Harold C. Phillips, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Cleveland, Ohio. The first of his four lectures constitutes our opening article in this issue. Cold type cannot capture the scintillating quality of the addresses which captivated the large audiences in the Alumni Memorial Chapel daily, but the reader will be able to see why Dr. Phillips has been recognized as one of the ablest pulpiteers among Baptists of the world. Educated at Denison University, Columbia, and Union Theological Seminary, he has for twenty-five years held the strategic pastorate in Cleveland. Author of several books, Dr. Phillips is planning to augment and revise the Mullins series for later publication. For that book, this present article serves as an appetizer to our readers.

The Biblical doctrine of election has been subjected to widely contradictory interpretations by various schools of thought. A sane, scholarly view is set forth herein by Dr. Julius R. Mantey, professor of New Testament at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago. Dr. Mantey holds both the Th.D. and Ph.D. degrees from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, where he did his major work under A. T. Robertson. Before going to his present position, he taught Bible in Union University, Jackson, Tennessee. He is the author of several books, and at present is a member of the commissions which are preparing collations of New Testament manuscripts with a view toward publishing a complete new critical apparatus for the study of the texts. He is also chairman of a committee appointed by the Evangelical Theological Society to explore the advisability of getting out a new translation of the Bible.

Dr. Guy H. Ranson joined the faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in the fall of 1952, coming from a teaching position at William Jewell College to be-

come Assistant Professor of Christian Ethics. A native of Texas, graduate of Hardin-Simmons College, he received the Th.M. and Th.D. degrees from Southern, and did further work at Yale. His thoughtful article on Augustine's theory of the origin of evil indicates the solid Biblical and theological background which Dr. Ranson brings to the study of Christian Ethics.

When the editors published in the April issue an article on Calvin's conception of faith, written by Dr. George Gordh, it was hardly anticipated that the article would call forth so prompt and positive a reaction as that which is found in the current issue. Dr. James M. Bulman, now pastor of the Cornelius Baptist Church, Cornelius, North Carolina, takes issue with Dr. Gordh on his basic thesis. Dr. Bulman was well prepared to give a critical reading to Gordh's article, having written his dissertation for the Th.D. degree at Southern Seminary on the subject, "A Comparison of John Calvin's and Emil Brunner's Doctrine of God." The reader may judge for himself whether Gordh or Bulman has rightly interpreted the great reformer's idea of faith.

Of an unusual nature is the article by Dr. Carl Tabb Bahner. But then Dr. Bahner is a man of unusual combinations. Head of the Chemistry Department at Carson-Newman College and an active member of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, he is also a deacon in the First Baptist Church of Jefferson City, Tennessee, and sponsor of the Baptist Student Union and the Mission Volunteer Band for the college. After receiving his M.S. degree in Organic Chemistry at the University of Chicago, he enrolled at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and took the full course, winning the Th.M. degree in 1931. This was followed by further graduate work at Yale and at Columbia, where he received the Ph.D. in Industrial Organic Chemistry in 1936. Few men are so well qualified by training and personal experience to write upon the harmony of Science and Religion. It is hoped that this is but the first of a series of articles from Dr. Bahner.

The concluding article is by Dr. William A. Irwin, Professor Emeritus of Old Testament at the Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas. Since Dr. Irwin was a member of the revision committee which was largely responsible for the final form of the Old Testament section of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, it is appropriate that he be given opportunity to reply to some of the criticisms which have been made of the translation. This is in line with the established policy of the *Review and Expisitor* to print both sides of controversial issues in the interest of truth and better understanding. We expect to carry further articles on this important question in the future, not with a view to prolonging acrimonious debate or involving personalities in bitter controversy, but in the spirit which Dr. Irwin praises, discussing differences "quietly and objectively, asking of the other no more than an eagerness to examine relevant facts and to appraise fairly and dispassionately their meaning."

THE GOSPEL AND THE PREACHER

BY HAROLD C. PHILLIPS

Whatever may be the current estimate of preaching, the fact is that historically preaching has been the main method of spreading the gospel. It may indeed be said that in the creative period of the church's history preaching was the exclusive method. The New Testament was written by preachers. We read that John the Baptist came preaching, that Jesus came preaching. Peter preached, so did Paul. Jesus said to his disciples, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." The New Testament is replete with sermons. And no wonder, for it was largely written by preachers.

The apostolic fathers who were "the connecting link between the apostles and the apologists" were preachers. The Greek and Latin apologists preached. In short, the history of Christianity from the first century until now is inseparably connected with the preaching of the gospel.

It is always wise for a preacher to have a text. The older I become the more certain am I that the Bible is invaluable. There is no adequate substitute for it in preaching, indeed in living. I propose then to base my remarks today on the words of a great preacher. In his letter to the Roman's Paul writes: "For whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?"

There are three words in this revealing series of sequences that arrest our attention: "gospel," "preacher," "hearer." Paul did not of course mean to infer that if only people could hear the gospel they would respond. His experience on Mars Hill, to mention no other, taught him otherwise. It is perhaps a disquieting fact that in the parable of the sower only twenty-five per cent of the soil responded. Sometimes the lack of response is not the preacher's fault but the gospel's fault. The demands of the

gospel are often too rigorous and exacting for our indulgent and undisciplined lives. Dean Inge caustically remarks that there would be fewer people in churches if the gospel were preached in them. I do not think our primary concern is the response. The response of the hearer is not the preacher's responsibility. His responsibility is planting and watering. "Paul may plant, Apollos water, but God gives the increase." The response is in the hands of God. Our responsibility lies in the realm of communication.

Paul sees the preacher as the channel through whom the gospel is made known, the connecting link between the gospel and the hearer. How best to present the truths of the eternal gospel with a view to getting a response: that is the preacher's problem and privilege. Without entering into the interesting sequences in the text, I propose that we center our thought on one question, "How can they hear without a preacher?" The preacher communicates the gospel through preaching.

Now in communicating anything there are at least three essential considerations. If one is to communicate something he must know what he is trying to communicate. First and most obviously let us ask, what is the nature of the gospel which we seek to communicate? It is conceivable that a preacher may attract large crowds, yet if what he gives people is not the Christian gospel then he is not what Paul meant by a preacher. For there is something unique about the gospel. A preacher is not necessary if our aim is just to make people vaguely religious. How well Paul knew that. "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are very religious," he said. When you say a man is a religious man you say so much that you say nothing. Adolph Hitler was fanatically religious; so was Joseph Stalin. A religious man may be a tyrant, a secularist, a saint, or anything in between. In a real sense every man is religious. It has been said, "Destroy a man's faith in God and he will worship humanity; destroy his faith in humanity and he will worship science; destroy his faith in science and he will worship himself; destroy his faith

in himself and he will worship Samuel Butler," or, I might add, someone vastly worse—Joseph Stalin.

A Christian is a religious man, but a religious man is not necessarily a Christian. Far from that. If our aim is to make people religious the preacher Paul talks about is not necessary. But he is if we aim to make men Christian. For there is something unique in Christianity, something which though meant for man did not come from man. "The gospel which was preached of me is not after man," said Paul, "for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

The unique truth of the gospel centers in the Christian revelation. The truth we communicate is that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; that in Christ God has entered history in some unique sense and has revealed most fully His nature, His purpose, will, love and grace; that in Christ man is offered salvation, pardon, power and a goal for all his striving: the kingdom of God. The heart of the gospel grows out of the conviction that came to the disciples that in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus they had been witnesses to the climax of God's great purpose towards the world since its foundation. The gospel therefore in its deepest nature is not philosophy, psychology, sociology, even morality—though it certainly impinges on all four fields—but theology. When General MacArthur said that the human problem is theological he was profoundly right. Christianity has been saying that for nineteen hundred years. Man's problem is theological because it springs from his relationship with God, and so with his fellow men in the light of that relationship.

We modern Christians are more concerned about the fruits of Christian living than the roots of Christian belief. A visitor to our shores has said that he thinks the text which we Americans take most to heart is the one that says Jesus "went about doing good," particularly the kind of good that involves going about! I believe, however, that one can see the pendulum swinging back, and it is time it did. We shall have to return to the roots of our faith in order to get

the right response from the hearer. For of this much there can be not the slightest doubt: if the early apostles had been concerned first of all with the fruits, if they had gone out to preach just "the Sermon on the Mount" or the "Golden Rule" or "brotherhood," or any of the other great and noble insights of Jesus, if that had been their gospel, one questions whether Christianity would have survived. The apostles did preach the ethical teachings of Jesus; more, they lived and died for them. But the apostles did not base their faith on the validity of Jesus' teaching; not primarily upon what Jesus said but upon the kind of person they believed Jesus to be and the unique relationship which they felt he maintained with God.

For if truth be told there is little than can, strictly speaking, be called unique in Jesus' ethical teaching. Most of what Jesus said had been said before by the rabbis. To be sure, originality does not consist simply in saying something that nobody else has ever said. Originality also consists in giving to old truths fresh meanings and new relevance. I think it must be agreed that even though Jesus repeated so largely the ideas of his predecessors, he gave to the old truths a slant, a freshness, a winsomeness, a vitality and vigor they never to that degree possessed before. The old wineskins could not contain his truth because the wine he poured into them was new wine. It had ferment. Nevertheless the uniqueness of Jesus' ministry was not primarily in the teaching but in Jesus himself. The power of the gospel lay not in what Jesus said as such but in what Jesus was.

Listen to how Paul begins his letter to the Romans: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, which he had promised afore through his prophets in the holy scriptures, concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead: by whom we have received grace and apostleship, for obedience to the faith among all

nations, for his name: among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ: . . . . Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ." "God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ"—the emphasis is on Jesus' person, Jesus, the revealer of God.

Through all the centuries men had been looking for some word from this God. They had caught glimpses of Him in nature, in the glory of nature that inspired them, and even in the terror of nature that awed them. They had felt God in the moral pressures of conscience, as duty and desire wrestled together. They thought they saw God, and indeed they did, in the great personalities of their history, the seers and the prophets. But still they looked, looked until they found a little baby lying in a manger; and then they saw him, now full-grown, hanging on a cross, and later felt the power of his risen life in their own souls. In this life they believed God had come, God had lived and loved, and indeed God Himself had suffered for man's redemption, to bring man back to harmony with His purposes. As they put it: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself."

A true as well as clever description of preaching that stays on the circumference is found in the oft-quoted remark of Arnold Lunn: "There is no market for sermons on the text 'God so loved the world that he inspired a certain Jew to inform his contemporaries that there was a great deal to be said for loving one's neighbors'."

This then is the truth we are trying to communicate. Christian preaching must therefore be, broadly speaking, theological. This surely does not mean that the preacher will regard his church as though it were a classroom or his pulpit as a chair of systematic theology. Our fathers in their day and generation used this method, and quite effectively. You will perhaps recall the old story related about the small daughter of Charles G. Finney. Dr. Finney's little daughter once opened the front door to confront a tall man unknown to her. The stranger happened to be an eminent theologian. He asked the child if her father was

in. "No," she replied, "father is not at home, but come right in, you poor miserable sinner; I can tell you all about the plan of salvation."

For better or worse the plan of salvation presented in a technical, narrow, abstract fashion today will not reach the modern mind—a mind "so alien to all our Christian categories that it can scarcely understand any more when we pronounce the word sin and acclaim the coming of a Saviour." What then does one mean by preaching theology? Two things perhaps.

For one thing the preacher will use the great and timeless themes of the Bible. For myself I should rather preach a mediocre sermon on some great Biblical truth than an eloquent sermon on a small or trivial matter. I should rather give people a glimpse, however hazy, of the vast ocean than explore exhaustively some little backyard pool. Theology is a telescope, and telescopes are not to be looked at but through. Through theology one views the eternal stars of truth. There is a streak of pettiness in man, and we need constantly to be reminded of Him whose ways are not ours. The gospel is not only good news, it is big news—the biggest news man has ever heard. It is the preacher's job to cut vistas through the dense foliage that surrounds the mind, push back the walls that suffocate the soul. "He hath set my feet in a large place." The preacher who consistently neglects the great truths of the Bible may be interesting, informing, even helpful, but he is not communicating the truth that Paul said men ought to hear.

In his lectures to his students Spurgeon has some pertinent remarks on this very matter: "Brethren, if you resolve in your pulpit utterances to deal with important verities, *you must not forever hover around the mere angles of truth* . . . Do not paint the details of the background of the gospel picture with the same heavy brush as the great objects in the foreground of it. . . . I know a minister whose shoe-latchet I am unworthy to unloose, whose preaching is often little better than sacred miniature painting—I might almost say holy trifling. He is great upon the ten toes of the beast, the

four faces of the cherubim, the mystical meaning of badgers' skins, and the typical bearings of the staves of the ark and the windows of Solomon's temple: but the sins of business men, the temptations of the times, and the needs of the age, he scarcely ever touches upon. Such preaching reminds me of a lion engaged in mouse-hunting, or a man-of-war cruising after a lost water-butt. Topics scarcely in importance equal to what Peter calls 'old wives' fables,' are made great matters of by those microscopic divines to whom the nicety of a point is more attractive than the saving of souls. There is such a thing as meanness of mental occupation unbecoming the rank of an ambassador of heaven" (p. 120-122). Spurgeon is saying forcibly, preach on great themes.

There is yet another mark of theological preaching. Such preaching, because it is concerned with the big themes of our faith, will communicate a sense of otherness. Without the theological assumptions of our faith worship is meaningless. George Sylvester Horn spoke often to his students of the inspiration he obtained from his garden. They expressed their disappointment when they saw how small a place the garden was. The great preacher, pointing to the sky, said, "Ah, but see how high it is!" Theology gives the preacher his sky. The world today is full of preachers and gospels galore. But the emphasis that differentiates the Christian preacher from his multifarious contemporaries is that he does not just look out or down but up. He views the contemporary scene "sub specie aeternitatis." He views human life under a light that transcends the human scene; against the background of God's revelation. He knows that the key to man's difficulty is not economic, political, social or even moral, but spiritual. This is because man's biggest problem is man himself, and that problem is insoluble save as man recognizes his finitude, his frailty, the ambiguities that inhere in his very being, and knows that only in God can he find his way, discover the deeper wisdom without which his knowledge is vain, and that cosmic companionship apart from which as Goethe said, man is a troubled wanderer upon a darkened earth. A preacher may not be elo-

quent or learned but if through the spirit of reverence, humility and faith he is able to communicate the sense of the Eternal, he need not be ashamed. Ruskin put the matter well. "The duty of the clergyman," he once said, "is to remind people in an eloquent manner of the existence of God."

"How can they hear without a preacher?" In the second place, to communicate the gospel the preacher must not only know what he is trying to communicate but how to communicate it so the hearer will respond. There is a "know how" in preaching no less than in scientific matters. We sometimes say of a man that he "knows how to preach," or "is a good preacher." We cannot all be good preachers. When I hear some masters of the art or read their sermons I am constrained to return to the farm whence I came. I am helped, however, when I remember that all pianists will never play like Rachmaninoff even though they practice the flesh off their fingers, or sing like Caruso though they vocalize till the cows come home. "There are diversities of gifts." To some he gave five talents, to others one. The preacher needs to remember that he is a servant of Christ, and his major concern should be that he does the best he can with the gifts he possesses. "Unto whomsoever much is given of him shall much be required." There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that if there be a day when we shall stand before God to give an account of our stewardship, some ministers whose names are unknown will receive a louder "well done" than others who may have won fame, simply because they have been faithful over a few things.

Whether, however, our gifts be many or few we are obliged to present our message as effectively as we may so that the hearer may more likely respond. This brings us to the field of homiletics, a field into which we cannot now enter. But there are two matters which broadly speaking a preacher should keep in mind as he contemplates the how of communicating the gospel.

For one thing our sermons to be effective must be relevant to life. Christianity differs from every other religion in that its deepest truth is found not in a doctrine, dogma, creed or law, but in a life. Christian truth is not an abstract idea, not a word, but the Word that was made flesh and dwelt among us. As Jeremy Taylor once put the matter, "When God would save man he did it by way of a man." The gospel was meant for life as the seed was meant for the soil, the leaven for the lump, the light for the darkness, as the ship was made for the sea. The gospel removed from life is like a ship stuck on a reef. A reef is no place for a ship!

"Art thou he that should come or do we look for another?" The answer was not argument but evidence: "Go and tell John what you have seen and heard"—look what the gospel is doing to life. Blind men see and deaf men hear. The leaven is in contact with the lump. In an age like ours, so obviously lost, preaching that splashes about in little eddies and is unrelated to the great currents that are sweeping our world is a betrayal of the Christian gospel. If there was ever a time when the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin, whether of the ecclesiastical or social variety, was disastrous if not sinful, that time is now, for the "weightier matters" are calling to us.

In a real sense all Christian preaching is life situation preaching. Such was the preaching of the Master; he knew what was in man, and the forces that were moving in his world. He wept not only at a grave but over a city that knew not the things that belonged to its peace. His preaching had a sharp cutting edge. It reached to the bone and marrow. "He stirreth up the people"—especially the proud and the privileged. He came not to send peace but a sword.

If preaching is relevant to life it will come to grips with moral and ethical realities. Much is being said today about "moralistic preaching." I am not sure that I know what moralistic preaching is, but it must be awful, and I sincerely hope I have not done much of it. We must distinguish clearly, however, between moralistic preaching and preaching that comes to grips with moral and ethical reality,

preaching that interprets and relates God to the moral and spiritual bewilderment of our time.

I hope I am not being unfair when I say that some of our modern theologians seems to have developed a positive dislike for morality. They speak as though morality were some sort of illegitimate waif abandoned on a doorstep. I cannot share that point of view. If a preacher who probes the moral sense and relates his preaching to the ethical issues of his day is "off the beam," then at least that preacher may gather consolation from the fact that he stands in good company. He stands with Amos and Isaiah, Micah and Hosea, and most of all with his Master. It is my opinion that when theology soars so high that it loses contact with moral and ethical realities it ceases to be Christian, for it ceases to be relevant to life. It severs the link that binds man to God—namely the moral sense. With the moral sense man is a little lower than the angels, without it a little lower than the brutes. The moral sense is God-given. Is it not the image of God in man?

Consider this statement of James: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world." Here is a text that shows how in Christianity theology and ethics are interrelated. The first half of the text, which refers to God and the Father, is obviously theological. The second half delineates the field of our ethical duties and moral aims: to meet human need and keep one's self unspotted from the world. Now I suppose the theologically minded preacher would stop with the first half of that text and forget the ethical and moral requirements, while the moralistic preacher would forget the first half and proceed to call on all the widows and orphans, striving meanwhile to lead a moral life. In both instances only a partial gospel would be preached, for in Christianity the moral life and the ethical obligations proceed from and are related to God and the Father, the God who is all and in all. In Christianity theology provides the roots of which ethics are the fruit. But

the roots and fruits are of the same tree. In my judgment the dilemma we are trying to create between morality and theology is as unreal and unbiblical as that between the personal and the social gospel. We do not have to choose between morality and theology, between the story of the Good Samaritan, humanitarianism, and that of the Prodigal Son, doctrine. They belong in the same gospel. Reconciliation to God, theology, is an empty phrase unless it operates to change the wrong relationships between man and his brother, and that is morality. Neither a theology which is other-worldly or a morality which is earth-bound is Christian. The Cross does not abrogate the Commandments; it fulfills them.

In considering the how of effective preaching something more basic than the relevance of the sermon is involved, namely, the relevance of the preacher. The most effective sermon is that which communicates most fully a sense of the Eternal God. And it is through the personality of the preacher, his spirit, his attitude, his life, that the the sense of God is communicated. Obviously if the preacher is to communicate a sense of God, he must himself know God. We cannot share that which we do not ourselves possess, or give what we do not have. What Carlyle said to the new minister who came to his parish could be said to all of us. "What this parish needs more than anything else," said Carlyle "is a man who knows God otherwise than by hearsay."

For there is a big difference between knowing about God and knowing God. It is the difference between reading a book about love and falling in love. It may be said that herein, broadly speaking, is the line of demarcation between theology and religion. Theology is knowledge about, religion is knowledge of. One is the knowledge obtained from books, the other from experience. One is theoretical the other personal, one is secondhand the other firsthand. One informs the mind, the other one kindles the heart.

Now the preacher needs both kinds of knowledge, for in all valid preaching there is an element of teaching. Paul's

words to Timothy are applicable to us also. "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." But the Word, for the preacher is not only the written word, or the spoken word, it must be a lived word, a living word. And the truth must not be simply as the prophet said, "A commandment learned by rote." It must be, as Paul declared, written "not in tablets of stone, but in the fleshly tablets of the heart."

This is where the communication of spiritual truth differs from the imparting of information in general. "I know *whom* I have believed," said Paul, not "what." The sense of awareness of God is more often "caught" than taught.

In making God known through preaching a great deal then depends on the preacher's attitude and spirit. This is a part of "the mystery of preaching." A preacher is something like an instrument. That the instrument should be itself in tune is the basic requirement. Never mind how skillfully the notes are struck, or how important the musical composition the artist seeks to interpret and impart, if the instrument is off key, out of tune, neither the player's own skill nor the importance of the composition will avail.

This, as I have suggested is a part of the mystery of preaching. Every minister knows how sometimes a sermon, as we say, goes well. It has wings. Or again his words, like the bird with a broken pinion just can't get off the ground. They do not soar; they crawl. Sometimes the sermon carries the preacher, and other times the preacher has to carry the sermon. And of all the burdens a minister has to bear that, I think, is the worse. The sermon then reminds me of nothing so much as the Babylonian gods that Isaiah ridiculed. "They bear their gods upon their shoulders, they carry them. They are a burden to the weary beast," or I ought add, the weary preacher.

I do not know if all ministers would agree, but for myself nothing is so exhilarating as a sermon that soars, and nothing so deadly, just plain awful, as one that crawls. And the difference in most instances is not in the sermon,

but in the preacher. His own physical, mental and spiritual condition is the key.

Sometimes the preacher feels as though he were simply God's mouthpiece, the earthen vessel through whom God is presenting his truth. At other times he feels as though he were preaching. There are times when I glance at my manuscript and see I am on page twelve, and subconsciously I say to myself, "Mercy, do I have to go through ten more pages of this?" I also notice that when I am not sufficiently aware of being used by God, I am always more noisy or vigorous than when I am. The psychologist, I suppose, would call this a compensation. When the preacher is conscious of his own spiritual inadequacy, he calls in his physical strength to supplement his shortcomings.

I am not of course suggesting that the preacher imitate the soft-spoken, mild mannered and obviously innocuous Mr. Peepers of television fame. Nor am I suggesting that God does not speak through us when we pound the pulpit, stamp the floor, or bellow like the bull of Bashan. I myself have been guilty of all this and on occasion still am. I take comfort in the words of Paul, "There are it may be many voices in this world and none of them without significance." But I believe the weakness of this sort of preaching is that it makes our hearers more aware of us than of God, more aware of the messenger than of the message. Exaggerated or extreme pulpit antics have a way of defeating their own end. What we have to say can be obscured by the way we say it. Our personalities instead of being channels, the means through which the sense of God is communicated, become ends in themselves. The most forceful preacher is not always the most vigorous or noisy one. There are indeed occasions when the preacher should pull out all the stops and "let her go." But one must always remember that physical force is not always an indication of spiritual power. The noisy cataract that comes roaring down the hillside is not as powerful as the silent reservoir. Job in arguing to God speaks of "the thunder of his power," and Elijah of "the still small voice." God speaks in both, no doubt. But

let us be sure when we thunder that it is God's thunder, and not the quite natural and often justified spirit of resentment, disappointment, anger or vengeance that we are turning loose. "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength."

I have an elderly friend who lives across the street from the church I serve. He is not a member and seldom comes, partly I think because of his failing strength; at least that's what he says. We often talk when I see him working out on his lawn. He once said to me, "Pastor, you know its a great thing to start an idea going, and then get out of its way." Speaking from my own experience, which I am not attempting to universalize, I have found that the degree to which I communicate a sense of the Eternal is the degree to which I am able to get out of the way, and allow the truth to speak for itself through my personality.

Sometimes when a preacher is in the midst of his discourse a voice says to him, "You are preaching a great sermon this morning." This voice too is not without significance. It shows how easily the spirit of pride insinuates itself even when a man may be preaching about the virtues of humility. I am reminded of the woman who said to Spurgeon, I believe, "You preached a great sermon this morning." "Madam," said the preacher, "The devil told me that before I left the pulpit." The preacher is more likely to communicate God, when he is not like a stained glass window, that catches the light and holds it, something to be looked at, but like a plate glass window which one looks through. The preacher transmits light. "Ye are the light of the world," said the Master. But the light did not shine on them, it shone from them, through them.

In trying to make God real through preaching then the first essential is the preacher. Every sermon is the projection of the preacher's personality. If in his heart there is humility, if he does not think of himself more highly than he ought to think, if he possesses understanding, sympathy, and moral courage, reverence and love, and some adequate sense that whenever he does anything that is really signifi-

cant it is God who works in him both to will and to do, then he will communicate the sense of God.

It was said of Spurgeon that he was a great preacher rather than a preacher of great sermons. "Take with you words," said Hosea. Words are powerful instruments, but their power for the preacher depends upon the degree to which what comes from the preacher's lips bears the impress of his life. The preacher will not be effective if his words outdistance his experience. His life must become a sort of laboratory in which he works out and experiments with the Christian truth. It is harder, so much harder to live the gospel than to preach it, and more basic. It takes great living to make effective preaching. Otherwise we are but writing large checks on insolvent banks. As William James once said in speaking of the Christian religion, "He who lives the life of it however narrowly is a better servant than he who merely knows about it, however much."

In the long last the preacher communicates the truth not by what he says but by what he is. It is through life that the living word becomes articulate. After James Russell Lowell had heard Emerson's Phi Beta Kappa address at Harvard he said, "Emerson's oration began nowhere and ended everywhere, and yet as always with that divine man it left you feeling that something beautiful had passed that way—something more beautiful than anything else—like the rising and setting of the stars." Few people take seriously the speeches of the average politician whose words quite often in no sense represent his intention, purpose or character. Phonograph records will not do in preaching.

The revised version makes a striking translation of the passage we are considering. The authorized has it, "How shall they believe in him *of* whom they have not heard?" But the revised says, "How shall they believe in him *whom* they have not heard?" The suggestion is a frightening one—people are not just to hear about Christ from the preacher, they are to hear Christ. However challenging or humiliating such a thought may be, there is truth in it.

This truth is illustrated in the story of a blind man whom Jesus had healed. The Pharisees, always on the alert, tried to discredit the incident. They questioned the man about Jesus. Was Jesus really the Messiah, was he from God, might he not be an impostor? To all these abstract questions the man could give no answer. He was not well informed. He could not see to read; he was blind, and there was no Braille in those days. What the man did say, however, was crucial. Said he, "Whether this man be a sinner or not I know not. One thing I know, that once I was blind and now I can see." And he stuck to that! What he knew was vastly more significant than what he did not know about. To be sure there is much we must know about Christianity; but actually it is not knowing about Christianity that makes one a Christian, but knowing Christ. "I know whom I have believed"; "that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his suffering." So Paul communicated the gospel. "I live, yet not I but Christ liveth in me." The more Christ lives in us, the more his spirit possesses us, and his love constrains us, the more effectively will we communicate his message, the more likely to get response from the hearer.

In some sense the miracle of the Incarnation occurs again in every preacher empowered by God's spirit. It was said of our Master, "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." No wonder then he could say, "The words I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." The word and the life were all of a piece. As Carnegie Simpson once put it, "In the beginning he opened his mouth and taught them. In the end he opened his heart and showed them."

"How can they hear without a preacher?" We have asked what are they to hear, what is the gospel the preacher seeks to communicate, what is the truth to which he seeks a response? We have in the second place inquired, how can the preacher most effectively communicate the gospel so the hearer may respond? There is, however, a third question: why should he? what is the reason for preaching? Paul gives the answer, "How can they preach

except they be sent?" Why do we communicate the message? Because God has sent us to do it! "Whom shall I send and who will go for us?" Then said I, "Here am I, send me." "As the Father hath sent me into the world, even so send I you into the world."

I like to look at the life-size figure of Phillips Brooks, that great preacher, in front of Trinity Church in Copley Square, Boston. Behind the preacher, as you recall, stands Christ with his hand on the preacher's shoulder. In our ordination it is not the hand of the bishop, the presbytery, or the congregation that counts. These are but human hands and like our own not wholly clean. It is the hand of Christ that gives power and authority to the preacher and validity to his message.

The conviction that we are sent ought to do two things to our preaching. For one thing it should give more of the sense of urgency, the sort of urgency the Master manifested when he said, "I must be about my Father's business"; "I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day"; the urgency Paul manifested when he said, "Now is the accepted time, today is the day of salvation"; "the time is short." In truth, the time is short—the soul hath its seasons. Our fathers had this sense of urgency. They preached as Richard Baxter advised, "as dying man to dying men." Men still die, and we are men.

This note of urgency is still present in the preaching of literalists, but it is too largely lacking from the preaching of us liberals. Too much of liberal preaching is devoid of passion, fervor, conviction. Too much of our heat has gone out in light. But light without heat is just as ineffectual as heat without light. Knowledge without zeal is no more adequate than zeal without knowledge. We liberals are often like those of whom Paul speaks, who are always learning but never coming to a knowledge of the truth. Walter Horton is right when he says that liberal Protestantism is too much a way of thinking rather than a way of living.

If the fact that God has sent us to preach His gospel does not quicken our spirits, surely the desperate condition

of our time should. The sickness of man has not changed; neither the cause of that sickness nor its possible cure. Isaiah could be describing our world when he wrote, "The whole head is sick and heart faint . . . there is no soundness . . . but wounds, and bruises, and fresh stripes." And what produced this condition? The same thing that has produced ours. "Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, . . . they have forsaken Jehovah, they have despised the Holy One of Israel." Many of our contemporaries may be too preoccupied with the froth and frivolities of our culture to contemplate man's condition, too morally obtuse to see the root cause of our tragic state, or too sophisticated to admit that the real cause is human sin. But if as preachers we see man as a sinner struggling with a body of death, and believe the gospel offers him salvation, then let us preach this gospel as though we really believed it. The great preachers believed it. One of them cried: "Necessity is laid upon me"; "woe is me if I preach not the gospel."

There is another characteristic of the man who is sent. It is perhaps the other side of the sense of urgency or mission. Shall we call it equipoise? It is the opposite of panic. It comes from the sense of being in the world yet not of it. The story has it that some millennialist came to Emerson quite excitedly once and exclaimed, "Mr. Emerson, the world is coming to an end." The great man replied calmly, "Very well, we can get on without it." The spirit to which I refer was manifested by the Master when he said, "Fear not them that kill the body and afterward have no more that they can do," or when he stood before Pilate without cowardice or cringing, or in regal silence before the dissolute Herod, or that made him say as he faced the cross, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you, . . . let not your heart be troubled." It was the same spirit that made the apostles sing in prison, "If God be for us who can be against us?" This was the spirit revealed by Elisha who, when his servant, panic-stricken at the sight of the Syrian army cried, "Alas, my master! how shall we do?" replied: "Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that be with them."

Our world today is insecure and uncertain. It is full of fear and of panic. The minister understands the reason for this and in a sense shares it, but he must not succumb to it. The symbol of his message is a cross. This faith of his was cradled in tragedy. It grew out of danger, disgrace, defeat and death. Darkness fell upon the earth when Christ was crucified, as darkness always falls whenever the truth is trampled. Darkness once more may cover the earth and gross darkness the people. But the man who tries to communicate the gospel will not lose heart.

No wholesome response springs from fear or bewilderment. Our faith assures us that God is light and that not all the stupidities, insanities and sins of man can put out that light. Even though man destroys himself and his world, he cannot destroy God, who is from everlasting to everlasting. This is still God's world. Men hunger for security, but there is no security for man, not for his body which returns to dust, nor his possessions, which either he leaves or which bury him. The gospel offers not security but salvation, not security but eternal life. We must remember that even the complete collapse of our civilization, far from involving the prestige of God, would enhance His prestige immeasurably and vindicate the eternal truth of His message. "The gospel of the good news of God is not annulled by the overthrow of civilization nor even by the end of humanity on earth." "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's."

"Safe though all safety's lost; safe where men fall;
And if these poor limbs die, safest of all."

This is the faith that undergirds the man who preaches the truth he is sent to declare.

THE DIVINE ELECTION

BY JULIUS R. MANTEY

The Biblical teachings on election are so intricately interwoven into the whole fabric of the Bible that they are inseparable from it and very much a distinct and vital part of it. According to Emil Brunner,[1] election constitutes the center and core of the teachings of the Old and the New Testaments.

The Apostle Paul implies that the doctrine was so important that God had it in mind before He created the universe. "He chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blemish before him in love . . . for we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works."[2] Or in other words, God through Christ, even before man was created had a redemptive program for man, which anticipated a favorable response from man, expressed by blameless character and loving service.

Calvin's over-emphasis on the negative aspect of predestination (although it is not synonymous with election) contributed toward bringing the whole doctrine of election more or less into disrepute. The gist of his viewpoint is summarized in this quotation from his *Institutes*: "By an eternal and immutable counsel God has once for all determined, both whom he would admit to salvation and whom He would condemn to destruction . . . God favors His elect because He will and has mercy because He will."[3]

While the Apostle Paul did say, "He hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth,"[4] he nevertheless did not apparently, have in mind, according to the context, God's dealings with men as a whole, but rather chiefly with Pharaoh, whom God used to make the lot of the Israelities so unbearable in Egypt that they would gladly follow Moses' leadership and seek to escape from their un-

---

1. *The Christian Doctrine of God*, 1950. Page 303.
2. Eph. 1:4; 2:10.
3. *Institutes* 3: 21-7; 3: 22-8.
4. Rom. 9:17-18.

endurable bondage. When Paul speaks of "vessels of wrath" he seems to be referring to various nations that God used at different times to discipline Israel, the "vessel of mercy."[5] He was not discussing unredeemed individuals, apparently. The basic thought, emphasized by Paul, was that God's decisions and choices should never be questioned, since His character and love would always impel Him to do right. His sovereignty, therefore, should never be impugned.

The New Testament certainly has many statements that teach that God was not predestinating anyone to destruction, but rather that He was always motivated by infinite love, and was seeking to redeem man and to elevate him to fellowship with Himself. The Apostle John says: "God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the World should be saved through him."[6] And in speaking of the efficiency of Christ's death, he affirms that "He was the propitiation not for our sins only but also for the whole world."[7] Or in other words, God's grace has made redemption possible for every man. But since God has created man free, God cannot coerce man to serve Him, even by His infinite love, without infringing upon man's freedom. Christ stands at the crossroads of life. Choosing Him brings God's favor forever; rejecting Him brings God's disfavor forever! J.K.S. Reid says God's gracious offer of mercy is so generous that "All are predetermined to election."[8] "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."[9] But man must cast for himself the vote that decides the election. There is some merit in a Negro minister's explanation of the doctrine: "God votes for you. The Devil votes against you. Then you vote, and you decide the election." God's readiness to forgive and redeem can be thwarted by man's recalcitrance and impenitence. Even divine love is expressed in vain when it does not enlist response and co-operation in man.

5. Rom. 9:22-23.
6. John 3:17.
7. John 2:2.
8. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. I, No. 2.
9. II Cor. 2:19.

The Election of a Nation

According to the Genesis account, although God had chosen and signally blessed many individuals, from earliest antiquity and onwards, the most significant manifestation of an unbroken sequence of chosen men begins with Abraham, who is informed that he is to become the father of a multitude, the founder and forefather of a new type of nation. "All the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him."[10] His seed is to become as numerous as the sands of the sea and the stars of heaven. But these far-reaching and awe-inspiring promises were not made to Abraham unconditionally. "Walk before me and be thou perfect,"[11] the record reads. "And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly."[12] Abraham was directed to command his children . . . "that they keep the way of Jehovah, to do righteousness and justice; to the end that Jehovah may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."[13]

And God's declaration of readiness to bless Isaac begins with the condition that Isaac be submissive to God's will: "Go not down into Egypt. Dwell in the land which I shall tell thee of . . . and I will be with thee and bless thee . . . and I will establish the oath which I swore unto Abraham thy Father."[14] From these statements we learn that the election is never merely automatic and unconditional. A covenant with God required renewal by each succeeding generation or it became invalid. However, the Old Testament writers never state nor imply that it was man's worth that elicited God's favor, but rather that it was God's gracious generosity that put the elect under constant obligation to serve God. This is recognized in Jacob's charge to his household when he said: "Let us arise, and go to Bethel; and I will make there an altar unto God, *who*

10. Gen. 18:18.
11. Gen. 22:17.
12. Gen. 17:1-2.
13. Gen. 18:19.
14. Gen. 26:2-3.

answered me in the day of my distress and was with me in the way which I went."[15]

In discussing God's choice of Jacob, H. H. Rowley has well said: "Sometimes God chooses those who are not particularly choice. This is not the demonstration of His arbitrariness, but of His wisdom and His grace . . . For the character that he came to attain Abraham was chosen; Isaac and Jacob less for themselves than for those who should come after them."[16]

And Israel as a nation was not chosen because she was better than other nations. "Rather it was the miracle of Divine grace that God chose her in her weakness and worthlessness and lavished His love upon her."[17] Jehovah thy God hath chosen thee to be a people for his own possession . . . Ye were the least of all people. It was because Jehovah loved you . . . that he redeemed you out of the house of bondage from the hand of Pharaoh, King of Egypt."[18] Israel's greatness was due to God's goodness. But God not only chose Israel but also claimed her for service. And the elect community realized that this claim was valid and concurred in it by ratifying the covenant at Mount Sinai, in which she agreed to obey and serve God wholeheartedly." Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and set before them all these words which Jehovah commanded him: and all the people answered together, and said, "All that Jehovah hath spoken we will do."[19] Here because God has delivered Israel, she pledges herself to Him. Her election is seen to be, not something automatic that made her His people for all time by mere physical generation. But, on the contrary, we see that she entered into the covenant voluntarily, and each generation to become eligible for its benefits had to renew it by accepting for itself its obligations, which meant the doing of God's will, or it would place itself outside the covenant. It was man's response to divine grace, and

15. Gen. 35:3.
16. *The Biblical Doctrine of Election,* 1950, p. 35.
17. H. H. Rowley, *Ibid.,* p. 78.
18. Deut. 7:7-8.
19. Exod. 19:7-8.

only the heirs of response could be the heirs of the covenant.[20] Repudiation of the covenant by Israel released God from obligation to her. The promises that went with the election were binding on God only so long as, and while Israel obeyed God. But He, in spite of Israel's waywardness and stiff-neckedness, lavished His favor upon her, generation after generation. His love motivated Him to do far beyond what He had agreed to do. God's patience often postponed His punishments, which nevertheless came in the form of invasions, famines, diseases and disasters of many kinds, and finally captivity.

Discipline for Disobedience

When the nation, groups in the nation, or individuals violated their covenant with God, they became liable to the extent of their sins. All that escaped from Egypt perished in the wilderness, except Caleb and Joshua. The rebellion of Korah resulted in immediate extermination of Korah and his many followers.[21] Achan's theft resulted in speedy elimination of himself and his family. Thus God sought to teach the divine community that His election of them would be favorable to them only to the extent that they kept faith with Him and served Him constantly and consistently. Isaiah reminded them of this when he said: "Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? Did not Jehovah, he against whom we have sinned?"[22] And he even predicted that the curse of God would be upon them and that God would switch His favor to non-Jews: "And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen; and the Lord Jehovah will slay thee; and he will call his servants by another name (Christian?): so that he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth."[23]

So we see, all through the Old Testament, the recognition that Israel's election involved obligation for Israel, "and

20. H. H. Rowley, *Ibid.*, p. 48f.
21. Num. 16:20-35.
22. Isa. 42:24; 63:10.
23. Isa. 65:15-16.

that the repudiation of those obligations was tantamount to the repudiation of the election."[24] The severe denunciation against the divine community by Amos and other prophets were due solely to Israel's violation of its covenant with God.

And Paul's statement in the New Testament in Romans 11:26, "all Israel shall be saved," needs to be interpreted in the light of Israel's historical background prior to Paul's day as well as in the light of all that Paul wrote with reference to Israel. Since the quotation is not preceded by an inferential conjunction, but rather by a correlative adverb of manner (*houtos*), and followed by a correlative adverb of comparison (*kathos*), it should not be translated, "So all Israel shall be saved," but rather, "*After this manner* will all Israel be saved," just as it is written, "There shall come out of Zion a Deliverer; He shall turn ungodliness away from Jacob." (Very likely Paul meant that Christ in His first coming was the Deliverer.) Or in other words, when Israel, or any Israelite turns away from ungodliness and instead turns his life and allegiance over to Christ, then those people will be saved, after the same manner as any other sinner can be saved. The New Testament does not appear to cherish the hope expressed by Jeremiah that Israelities from all nations would return to Palestine. It rather placed stress upon *what* we are before God rather than *where* we are or who our parents were. All boundaries of race and place as well as differences in color, were removed at the cross. Christians accepted as authoritative Jesus' pronouncement on this when He said, "Neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father . . . But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers."[25]

---

24. H. H. Rowley, *Ibid.*, p. 69.
25. John 4:21-23.

Israel's Mission to the World

Although the Israelities were supposed to demonstrate righteous and exemplary character, and to enlist the Gentile nations about them in worshipping Jehovah, the Creator of the universe, they nevertheless seem to have failed almost utterly in the latter. Isaiah called their attention to this purpose of God for them: "I, Jehovah, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thy hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, *for a light of the Gentiles . . . I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles,* that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth."[26] The book of Jonah gives one conspicuous example of God's concern for the inhabitants of the Gentile city Nineveh. But the Jews apparently did not seriously accept the role for themselves of persuading the world to worship and serve Jehovah. However, involuntarily, through frequent dispersions and captivities, they did help considerably to prepare the way for the extension of Christianity.

An Elect Remnant

Although the prophets by the time Judah was taken into captivity (586 B.C.) had decided that Israel's election had ended in failure, they nevertheless still retained hopes that at least a remnant would remain in God's favor. They prophesied that those, and only those, that accepted the obligations of loyalty to God, were the true heirs of the election and that they alone would escape the severe chastisement of Jehovah. All through Israel's history only a minority of the nation, with the possible exception of the early period of the wilderness wandering, kept its covenant with God. The majority regularly and repeatedly ignored or spurned Him. And so it has been with every nation and generation of people down to the present time. Man's perversity seems always to resist God's purpose and provision for man.

---

26. Isa. 42:6; 49:6; 66:18-20.

Isaiah frequently speaks of only a remnant returning to Palestine. "A remnant shall return, the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God. For though thy people, Israel, be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them shall return."[27] And Isaiah narrows down this select group to only a part of one tribe by saying: "The remnant from the house of Judah that escapes shall again take root downwards and shall bear fruit upwards."[28] And Isaiah further states, "the remnant shall be very small and of no account."[29] Jeremiah, and several of the minor prophets agree with Isaiah that it will be a disciplined and a repentant remnant that will return to Jerusalem.[30] But Ezekiel conceives of a new, and a regenerate Israel: "I will give them another heart, and a new spirit will I put in their midst . . . that they may walk in my statutes and keep my commandments."[31] And he attributes the transformation in their character to the grace and mercy of God. This vision however, finds fulfillment only after the coming of Christ and in the reign of the Holy Spirit in men's lives.

Elect Individuals

God in Old Testament times selected a nation as the object of His favor and as a channel for His revelation. And after that nation spurned His reign over them, He chose that small group within the nation, the remnant, that was responsive to His leadership. But God also elected outstanding individuals, such as Abraham, Moses, Gideon, David, and the numerous prophets. These men and many others like them, received God's revelation, exemplified His character, sought to do His will and to serve the people of their generation. David expressed well what men of every generation need to feel and to express, when he prayed, "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me."[32] Election to these stalwart leaders never meant ar-

27. Isa. 10:20-22.
28. Isa. 37:31.
29. Isa. 16:14b.
30. Jer. 23:3; Exek. 14:22; Amos 5:15; Micah 5:3; Zeph 3:13.
31. Ezek. 11:19f; 14:22; 36:22-25.
32. Ps. 51:10.

bitrary and blind favoritism. They knew and taught that they were obligated, because of God's grace and mercy, to reflect God's character within their own lives and to further God's will by service to others.[33] Apparently they were very much aware that they would forfeit God's favor if they did not serve Him, for David prayed, "Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me."[34]

But this emphasis upon individualism comes to full fruition only in the New Testament. The Christians alone are counted as the heirs of the election, and they are considered to be the true successors of Abraham. Abraham's physical descendants no longer had any monopoly on God's favor due to their non-conformity to His will. John the Baptist bluntly and courageously informed the Jews that being children of Abraham no longer had validity with God and that it did not guarantee God's pardon and peace; that God could even raise up children to Abraham from stones. They were sternly warned that unless they repented and showed fruits expressive of repentance they would remain forever outside the pale of God's protection and pardon. But to those that came to John for baptism with humility and in the right spirit he said: "I baptize you in water because of repentance but he that cometh after me is mightier than I . . . he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire."[35] And Matthew quotes Jesus as saying, "The Kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and it shall be given to a nation that bringeth forth its fruit."[36] That statement fits in with what Jesus said when informed that His mother and brothers were outside the crowd seeking to talk with Him. He disclaimed the value of physical and family relationship by saying: "Behold, my mother and my brothers! For whoso-

33. As to the significance of faith, covenant and confession for Christians cf. *The Review and Expositor,* Vol. XLVIII, April, 1951, p. 169, "Inadequately Translated Words in the New Testament" by Mantey.

34. Ps. 51:11.

35. Matt. 3:11. On *eis=because of* here cf. "The Causal Use of EIS in the New Testament," in *Journal of Biblical Literature,* Vol. LXX, Part I, 1951.

36. Matt. 21:43. Cf. also Matt. 8:11.

ever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother."[37]

The Church, the Divine Community

Luke and Paul both quote Jesus as having said: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood."[38] The early church interpreted this statement as connected with and as a fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy of the new covenant: "I will write my law on their hearts" (31:33). These first century Christians believed that Christ's Church superseded Israel and that the new covenant made invalid the old covenant.[39]

It seems beyond dispute that Paul thought of the Church as the true and only remnant of God. "They are not all Israel which are of Israel," he said. He contrasted the "Israel according to the flesh" with the "Israel of God," the Church of Christ.[40] In Romans the idea is made more personal: "For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart" (2:28f). To the Galatians, who were mostly Gentiles, Paul said: "Now we, brethren, are children of promise, as Israel was" (4:28f). But Paul develops the idea even further by teaching the Galatians: "If ye are Christ's then ye are the seed of Abraham, and heirs of the promises" (3:29). In Philippians 3:6, the Gentile Christians were informed: "For we are the true circumcision, who worship God in spirit, and who glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." And in writing to the Christians in Rome, Paul said: "We are the children of God; and if children, then, heirs, heirs of God, and fellow-heirs with Christ."[41]

In the first epistle of Peter, Christians, not Jews, were called "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a

37. Matt. 12:49.
38. Lk. 22:2; I Cor. 11:25.
39. Heb. 8:8-12; II Cor. 3:4-6; *diatheke* means agreement 31 times in the N. T. to only 2 meaning a will.
40. Rom. 9:6; I Cor. 10:18; Gal. 6:16.
41. Rom. 8:16-17.

special people."[42] The promises to Israel as recorded in Exodus 19:5, are here claimed for the Church. Christians have inherited the peculiar relationship, privileges and benefits that were once the sole possession of the Israelities.

All through the New Testament the term "elect" means believers in Christ. They are spiritual Israel, the seed of Abraham, the true remnant, the heirs of God, Christ's brothers and sisters, "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone."[43]

H. H. Rowley[44] points out that the Church not only claimed to be the heir of Israel's election but she also accepted the obligation of Israel's mission which was that she should, (1) share God's revelation with all humanity; (2) that she reflect the will and character of God in life; and (3) that, in a spirit of self-sacrificing love, she serve and help the needy wherever and whenever possible. "If He is the Servant . . . then also is the Church called to enter into the task of the Suffering Servant . . . The task of the Servant was to suffer. The Church is therefore called to enter the sufferings of the Cross in some measure, and to agonize for the world's redemption . . . The Biblical doctrine of election is therefore penetrated through and through with warning. To be the elect of God is not to be His pampered favorite. It is to be challenged to a loyalty and a service, and a sacrifice that knows no limits."

---

42. I Pet. 2:9.
43. Eph. 2:20.
44. *Op. cit.*, pp. 161-168.

AUGUSTINE'S ACCOUNT OF THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF MORAL EVIL

BY GUY H. RANSON

The problem of accounting for evil in nature and in man has always been one of the most difficult for Christians. St. Augustine was a man who had first hand acquaintance with moral evil and he grappled with it not only in appetite and will but sought to understand it intellectually. His interpretation of the nature and origin of moral evil has been the standard Christian interpretation for many centuries. There are, of course, variations on his ideas, but the commonly accepted Christian position is based upon St. Augustine. Thus, Augustine's understanding of the nature and origin of moral evil is a study which is very worthwhile to those who seek to overcome evil and enter into the joy of salvation.

The Nature of Evil

Perhaps it is well to follow Augustine's own approach to the problem of the origin of evil. In his work, *On the Morals of the Manichaeans,* Augustine states:

> You Manichaeans often, if not in every case, ask those whom you try to bring over to your heresy, Whence is evil? Suppose I had now met you for the first time, I would ask you, if you please, to follow my example in putting aside for a little the explanation you suppose yourselves to have got of these subjects, and to commence this great inquiry with me as if for the first time. You ask me, Whence is evil? I ask you in return, What is evil? Which is the more reasonable question? Are those right who ask whence a thing is, when they do not know what it is; or he who thinks it necessary to inquire first what it is, in order to avoid the gross absurdity of searching for the origin of a thing unknown?[1]

---

1. *On the Morals of the Manichaeans.* II. 2. Quotations in this paper are from *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church,* edited by Philip Schaff, and published by The Christian Literature Company, New York, 1892, Vols. I-VIII.

For fear that we shall be as the Manichaeans, "searching for the origin of a thing unknown," we shall seek to determine first the nature of evil as conceived by Augustine.

First he says evil is that which is contrary to nature, *contra natura.*[2] Evil is not itself nature, but it is the disruption of nature. Interference with harmonious existence or function of any part of nature is contrary to nature and is evil. This point is elaborated somewhat more in the work, *Against the Epistle of Manichaeus Called Fundamental.*[3] As any interference with nature is evil, he joins with the Manichaeans in condemning destructiveness, blindness, dense muddiness, terrific violence, perishableness, etc., and urges them to join with him in the commendation of form, classification, arrangement of harmony, unity of structure, symmetry of correspondence of members, wholesome adaptation, and the assimilation and agreement of the parts in the natures. Since God is the author of all natures, they work together harmoniously, but when harmony ceases nature is opposed and that is evil. He gives several illustrations to prove that evil is not nature, but the diminution of nature. In one illustration he states: "Take from waters their thickness and muddiness, and pure clear water remains; take from them their consistence of their parts, and no water will be left."[4] He continues: "If then, after the evil is removed, the nature remains in a purer state, and does not remain at all when the good is taken away, it must be the good which makes the nature of the thing in which it is, while the evil is not nature, but contrary to nature."[5]

Another evil, and this is almost equivalent to the first, is that which is inconsistent or incongruous, *inconvenientia,* with nature. A substance can never be evil in itself, but it may cause evil to another nature if it disagrees with it. Augustine tells the story of a female criminal in Athens who drank the amount of poison allotted as a fatal draught for

2. *Loc. cit.*
3. *Against the Epistle of Manichaeus Called Fundamental,* XXXIII. 36.
4. *Loc. cit.*
5. *Loc. cit.*

the condemned with little injury to herself. This was possible because she, knowing that the poison would be given her, built up her resistance by taking poison in gradually increased doses until the allotted amount could be drunk without fatality. Now, says Augustine, poison itself is not an evil because it can be rendered ineffective. If a substance were an evil in itself it would always in every instance be an evil and disagree with nature. One substance may be a food to one creature, medicine to another, and poison to still another. Therefore this or that substance is not an evil but only causes evil when it disagrees with nature.[6]

Evil is also that which is a privation of the good, *privatio boni.* Augustine says that "Whatever is hurtful takes away some good from that to which it is hurtful; for without the loss of good there can be no hurt."[7] He sees two kinds of good: "One good is that which is good supremely and in itself, and not by the participation of any good, but by its own nature and essence; and another good which is good by participation, and by having something bestowed."[8] The chief good is immutable, incorruptible, impenetrable, and inviolate, and such a nature cannot be hurt because this is God in whom there can be no lessening of nature. The second good is of creatures and can be lessened because they are made *ex nihilo* and are subject to change. Whenever a creature loses a part of its nature bestowed by God, that is evil. For nature to have less than its maximum good is evil. To be sure, some creatures are better than others, but the privation of good in one is evil to that one. Again it is emphasized that evil is not a nature, but only a term used to describe the privation of nature.[9]

Evil is want, *amassio,* of good or the negation, *negatio,* of good. The conception here seems to be the same as *privatio boni,* differing only in terminology. Evil is the

6. *On the Morals of the Manichaeans,* VIII. 12.
7. *On the Morals of the Manichaeans,* III. 5.
8. *City of God,* XI. 22.
9. *City of God,* XI. 22.

diminution of good. It is lessening of good.[10] It is a want of maximum good, or the negation of some of the good. It would seem that as good is negated evil would increase, and when all good is gone there would be perfect evil. But such is not the case, because as good diminishes being also diminishes, and when one is about to lay hold of perfect evil all vanishes into non-being. Evil exists only in relation to being, because being and goodness are equated.[11] Evil exists only so long as enough good remains to be diminished, but when good disappears evil also ceases to be.[12] Evil culminates in the complete extinction of the good and being of the nature to which it clings.[13] The end of evil is nonexistence.[14]

Evil is corruption, *corruptio.* Augustine states: "But corruption exists not by itself, but in some substance which it corrupts; for corruption itself is not a substance. So the thing which it corrupts is not corruption, is not evil; for what is corrupted suffers the loss of integrity and purity."[15] That which has no good to lose cannot be corrupted, but what is corrupted is a good perverted; and what is perverted suffers the loss of order, and order is good. Corruption cannot be a substance which has no good, but it is the perversion or the corruption of good.

Evil is defection, desertion, revolt, *defectio.* Here the conception of evil is related to the will. Evil is the turning of the will from a higher to a lower order. It is the desertion of immutable nature for mutable nature. This was the chief evil of Adam, and of all men, which is a turning of the will from God to self. Augustine states: "For when the will abandons what is above itself, and turns to what is lower, it becomes evil—not because that is evil to which it turns, but because the turning itself is wicked."[16] The will has caused evil because it desired a lower thing; not evil in

10. *Enchiridion,* 12.
11. *Ibid.,* 12-14.
12. *On the Nature of Good Against the Manichaeans,* 17.
13. *Confessions,* III, 12.
14. *On the Morals of the Manichaeans,* VI. 8.
15. *Ibid.,* V. 7.
16. *City of God,* XII. 6.

preference to good, because the nature from which it turned and the nature to which it turned are both good, but the choice of a lesser good for the highest good. When man chose to turn to himself in preference to God he chose something less than the best, and that is desertion of the highest good and is thus evil.

In dealing with the problem of evil it is well to remember that Augustine was most often refuting the theory he had learned from the Manichaeans which held that evil is a substance. The Manichaeans posited two original substances: God, the pure good spirit, the kingdom of light; and evil substance, the kingdom of darkness. This was metaphysical dualism, and against this Augustine revolted because he could not conceive an eternal substance, kingdom, and will in opposition to God. He became a metaphysical monist, and held tenaciously to the view that God is the only original being, essence, substance, and all that has being owes its origin directly to Him. He, therefore, thought of evil as defect, diminution, corruption, perversion, negation, and want of the original good nature created by God, and as a revolt against the will of God.

The Source of Evil

In dealing with the source of evil, Augustine repudiated theories prevailing in his day. Not only did this make way for his own theory, but these theories had a great influence upon shaping his own. We must briefly follow his refutation of these in order more adequately to understand his own teachings.

Augustine rejected the theory of the Manichaeans which taught that evil had as its source some eternal realm which was unoriginated and independent of God. In its doctrine of two antagonistic realms, Manichaeism found the source of evil and good; evil originated in the realm of darkness as good originated in the realm of light. But this dualism became extremely repugnant to Augustine once he had embraced the Catholic Faith which had already rejected the dualism of the Gnostics. He was firmly fixed upon the cos-

mological doctrine which taught all being had as its source one holy and righteous God. Because He was immutable, His nature could not be blended with the evil substance as the Manichaeans taught.[17] Neither would he tolerate the teaching that both a good and an evil nature were blended or operative in man.[18] All existence was God or created by Him, and all that exists as being or nature is good. Thus, no room was left for evil substance or a kingdom of darkness, so no evil could have as its source a non-existent realm.

Perhaps it would seem from Augustine's insistence that God is the creator of all being that he would then teach that God is the source of evil. But such a thought was abhorrent to him. For a time, it is true, it would have been easier for Augustine to believe that evil came as the result of an error on the part of God, than to believe that its source was an eternal realm antagonistic to God.[19] But he did not stop at this point very long. Soon we find him saying that it would be impossible, by chance or necessity, to corrupt the nature of God. He says that when seeking "whence evil itself was" he found that the substance of God could by no means be profaned. "Thy substance," he says, "can by no means be profaned. For corruption, truly, in no way injures our God, —by no will, by no necessity, by no unforeseen chance, —because He is God and what He wills is good, and Himself is that good; but to be corrupted is not good."[20] He continues by saying that God is not constrained to will evil, because of His omnipotence, and that evil could not occur as something unforeseen, because He knows all things.[21] Finally he says that God, the source of all good, could not be the source of evil.[22] It would be the acme of absurdity to attribute all being to God and then make Him the initiator of evil to destroy being.[23]

---

17. *On Continence*, 14.
18. *Confessions*, VII. iii. 5.
19. *Ibid.*, IV. v. xv. 26.
20. *Ibid.*, VII. ix. 6.
21. *Loc. cit.*
22. *Ibid.*, VII v. 7.
23. *On The Morals of the Manichaeans*, II. 3.

Although God is not the author of evil, it does not exist in the universe with complete independence of Him. Augustine would allow nothing in the universe independent of God. God does not create evil, but he does control it. God creates all things in so far as they exist, and he controls the diminution or perversion of existence.[24] Augustine could understand God's control of evil because this was necessary to the preservation of the harmony of the universe, but he had much difficulty in understanding why evil was permitted at all. Although he could not understand it, he never questioned the integrity of God. It must be done, he decided, in accordance with the most secret plans of God and the most just deserts of man.[25] In dealing with the "Fall," Augustine declares that God only permitted, did not cause, the evil choice.[26] He insists that evil takes nothing from nature except that which is permitted by the Creator.[27] God could have made it impossible for man to do evil, but He chose to give him freedom of will and put within his power the possibility of evil in order to proclaim what man's pride could bring upon him and what God's grace could accomplish.[28]

Having rejected both an evil principle and God as the source of evil, Augustine now is ready to say that the source of evil is to be found in rational creatures. But before locating this in the will, another consideration must be noted. This is metaphysical evil due to creation *ex nihilo*. Because all creatures are created out of nothing they are mutable, and because of this capacity for change there is the possibility that nature may fall away and tend toward nonexistence.[29] Because man is also created out of nothing, he has the same tendency to fall away toward nonexistence, and thus evil arises in him.[30]

24. *Ibid.*, VII. 10.
25. *Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, II. ix. 30.
26. *On the Trinity*, XIII. 16.
27. *Against the Epistle of Manichaeus*, XLI. 47.
28. *City of God*, XIV. 27; *On Rebuke and Grace*, 27.
29. *City of God*, XIV. 13.
30. *Against the Epistle of Manichaeus*, XXXVI. 41.

In dealing with the origin of evil in the freedom of the will, Augustine is not confined to man because he thought there were angels and diabolical creatures who were also in the kingdom of rational creatures. First in point of time and in degree of evil committed is the devil, *diabolus*. This creature was made by God and was originally good,[31] but it was through him that the first evil entered the realm of rational beings.[32] He is the author of that fatal flaw which pervades all human nature.[33] In so far as men are good they retain the original nature created by God, but in so far as they are evil they are under the control of the devil.[34]

The devil, then, is the first originator of evil, and before the time in which he did evil it had never been known or heard of in the universe.[35] Augustine now ponders the question of why this being originated evil, and concludes that be became the author of evil through pride. He chose to turn from the highest Being to himself. Evil arose in his will,[36] and by his own perversity he fell from an angel to become the chief of demons.[37] Here, then, is the first answer to our question, "What is the source of evil?" The devil, who was created good, became the first source of evil through wrong use of freedom of the will.

The prince of demons was not alone in his defection, but many more angels followed his example. Many from the ranks of angels chose the wrong course and followed the devil to become demons. Augustine strives to solve the question of why some angels fell while others remained faithful, and finally concludes that those who did not fall had more of God's grace.[38] They also had a greater degree of wisdom which gave to them the assurance of eternal felicity.[39] There was, then, no difference in their natures, (all

31. *City of God*, XI. 15.
32. *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, II. 4.
33. *Ibid.*, II. 21, 43, 49.
34. *Against Two Epistles of the Pelagians*, I. 36.
35. *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, II. 48.
36. *City of God*, XI. 17; *On Rebuke and Grace*, 27.
37. *On the Trinity*, XIII. xiii. 17.
38. *City of God*, XII. 9.
39. *Ibid.*, XI. 11.

had identical natures), but only in their wills and desires.[40] All of the angels which fell, including the devil, fell from no efficient cause but only through the perversity of their wills.[41]

The devil and the evil angels are not the only rational creatures who are the source of evil through the perversity of their wills, because men too originate evil in their wills. However, men differ from the fallen angels in that each angel fell only by the exercise of his own will whereas every man sinned in the first man, Adam, who fell. Now that we have found that Augustine taught that a perverse will is the source of evil, we are ready to pursue the next question.

How Evil Arises In Man

Augustine located the source of evil in the wrong use of the will, but he had great difficulty in explaining why the will of man was perverted so as to allow evil to arise in him. The theories prevalent in his day were investigated to see whether or not they could account for the will's being so used. We must follow him through his struggles in order more adequately to understand his final solution.

It was only natural that Augustine, having passed through the Platonic tradition, should have investigated the theory of the preexistence of souls. If souls have existed in a previous state it is possible that one might find there a cause or influence which would lead the soul to apostatize from God in this life. In the *Confessions* Augustine seems undecided, but cannot bring himself to support the theory.[42] In the work *On the Trinity* he contests Plato's account of the boy who knew geometry from a prior existence.[43] In the work *On the Merits and Remission of Sins* he concludes that men yet unborn have not committed any act which would determine their moral deserts in this life.[44] In a letter

40. *Ibid.*, XII. 1.
41. *Ibid.*, XII. 8.
42. *Confessions*, I. vi. 9; X. xx. 29.
43. *On the Trinity*, XII, xv. 24.
44. *On the Merits and Remission of Sins*, I. 33.

to Jerome on the origin of the soul, the reminiscence theory is definitely rejected,[45] and Augustine further rejects the idea that souls are sent into bodies for sins previously committed. He states: "But that souls sin in another earlier life, and that for their sins in that state of being they are cast down into bodies as prisons, I do not believe: I reject and protest against such an opinion."[46] The same view is also supported in the work, *The Soul and Its Origin.*[47] Augustine definitely rejects the theory of preexistence of souls, and it is quite clear that the will did not there contract some malady which makes it susceptible to perversion in this life.

It is quite definite that Augustine rejected the popular theory that evil originated in man's bodily nature. It should be remarked, however, that although he rejected the flesh as the origin of evil, he did believe that flesh was a powerful instrument of evil. Although he dwelt much on the dangers of lusts of the flesh, he did believe flesh to be good because created by God, and refuted the Manichaeans who taught that it was inherently evil.[48] In fact, Augustine maintained that the soul causes the corruption of the flesh which in turn becomes the instrument by which the soul lusts.[49]

Augustine also rejected the theory (of the Stoics) that evil exists as the necessary concomitant of good. This theory contends that the attainment of virtue is impossible without the presence of evil. Evil exists to be overcome, and in the struggle the individual acquires virtue. Augustine states that the presence of evil increases our appreciation of the good, and that it may be used for good.[50] As shade increases the beauty of the picture, so sin renders good more beautiful.[51] Evil is made to serve some good or God, who is omnipotent, would not allow it to exist.[52] Augustine

45. *Epistle CLXVI*, ix. 27.
46. *Loc. cit.*
47. *The Soul and Its Origin*, I. 6.
48. *On Continence*, 22.
49. *Ibid.*, 19.
50. *Enchiridion*, 11.
51. *City of God*, XI, 23.
52. *Enchiridion*, 96.

readily recognizes that evil is universal and that no one lives without sin,[53] but he is far from willing to say that evil originated out of necessity. In fact, he states explicitly that evil exists as the just reward of man's sin, but not from necessity.[54]

Having dealt with these other theories we are now prepared to hear Augustine assert his positive teaching that evil originated in the will which was made of such nature by God that it could choose something lower than the highest Being. However, man would not have sinned had he not been seduced by the devil.

It is interesting to note Augustine's change of position on freedom of the will in two bitter controversies. Against the Manichaeans he argued that man in the present is able both to will and to do either good or evil, but in the controversy with the Pelagians he argues that man can will evil only and that he cannot do good except by the aid of God's grace.

But we must first determine how man came to his present condition. Augustine conceived man in his original condition, Adam in the Garden, to be free and perfect. As originally created by God Adam was free from all evil, endowed with every good, exempted from the ravages of time and capable of living forever, had perfect health of body and undisturbed peace of soul; there was no want in him, and all the vicissitudes of life were unknown to him.[55] If he had chosen by his free will to continue in this happy state he would never have known death or misery,[56] but he sinned in choosing a lesser being and lost the original perfection.[57] If Adam had not sinned he could have continued to do good unaided, but in his evil choice freedom to do good except through God's grace was lost, and then he and all his posterity could choose evil only.[58] Thus, the result of the

53. *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, I. 28.
54. *On the Trinity*, XIII. xvi. 20.
55. *City of God*, XIV. 26.
56. *On Rebuke and Grace*, 28.
57. *Ibid.*, 32.
58. *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, II. 9.

fall was the loss of freedom to do good, and the natural man is now free only to do evil.[59]

Another important consideration in connection with the fall is that of lusts connected with sex. Augustine regarded sex originally to have been devoid of all lust[60] and subject to the perfect control of the will.[61] After the fall sex is accompanied by lust, and thus the door is opened to further sins.

Another consideration is that the fall has its serpent which to Augustine is identified with the devil. Evil had already entered the universe through the evil will of the devil, and now we find this creature enticing man to allow evil to enter through man's will.[62] Thus, there are two factors at work: the subtlety of the devil who deceived, and man who yielded his will to deception.[63] The devil, then, is not only the first originator of evil, but is also the influence which led the first man to sin. But it should be noted that the devil is only the influence in man's sin, because man himself is the originator of his own evil. His sin was, like that of the devil and the wicked angels, disobedience which consisted in doing his own will in preference to that of God.[64] Thus, evil came into the human race because of pride which caused man to choose himself, a lower being, in preference to God, the highest Being. Evil entered the ranks of mankind through this first sin, and because all of the race was in Adam this sin and guilt passed to each individual of the race.[65]

Augustine not only made the original sin to consist in wrong use of the will, but also makes all actual sins in the present to consist in the same. The good nature in man is from God, but the inherent flaw which leads man to evil was inherited from Adam.[66] All evil in man was caused from

59. *Enchiridion*, 30.
60. *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, II. 53 sqq.; I. 24.
61. *On Original Sin*, 40.
62. *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, II. 57.
63. *On Original Sin*, 43.
64. *City of God*, XIV. 12.
65. *Enchiridion*, 30.
66. *On Original Sin*, 38.

wrong use of a free will. Actual sins are from wrong use of individual will, and original sin was from wrong use of Adam's will. Each individual of the race shared in Adam's sin and guilt because all of the race was in Adam. Augustine thinks of human nature as a mass existing in Adam, and all of it was already corrupted when it found particular individualization.[67] Since all human nature was corrupted in Adam, each individual of the race is under condemnation.[68]

There is but one primary source of evil, but there are secondary sources also. He states the primary cause thus: "I think there cannot be any doubt . . . that the only cause of evil is the falling away from the unchangeable good of a being made good but changeable, first in the case of an angel, and afterwards in the case of man."[69] He then states two secondary causes: "Following upon this crept in, and now even in opposition to man's will, *ignorance* of duty, and *lust* after what is hurtful."[70] But even these are defects in the will or cause the evil in the will through ignorance of right or lead it astray through lust.

Augustine now has four classifications in rational beings according to their ability to will and to do. First are the good angels who, through their long fidelity, have attained such wisdom and are so strongly supported by God's grace that they cannot will evil and can do no sin.[71] Second is restored man, he who has had his sins remitted, who is able to will and to do good with the aid of God's grace.[72] Third is fallen man, whose sins are not remitted, who is able to will evil only and is free only to sin.[73] Fourth is the devil and the fallen angels who will and do evil, and who can never be reclaimed. Their apostasy is permanent and they can never be restored.

---

67. *Confessions*, XII. xxvi. 36.
68. *Enchiridion*, 17; *On Original Sin*, 34.
69. *Enchiridion*, 23.
70. *Ibid.*, 24. Italics are Augustine's.
71. *City of God*, XII. 1; XI. 11; *Enchiridion*, 28.
72. *Enchiridion*, 30, 32, 41.
73. *Enchiridion*, 30.

We have found that evil originated in the will, and the cause was pride. The first evil was committed by the devil. The next evil was through angels who apostatized through the influence of the devil. Evil then entered the human race through Adam who through pride was influenced by the devil to sin. All the race sinned in Adam, but individuals now sin through their own wills. Thus, the will is the source of evil, and pride is its chief cause.

THE PLACE OF KNOWLEDGE IN CALVIN'S VIEW OF FAITH

BY JAMES M. BULMAN

A part of the policy of what for lack of a better name may be called the "neo-orthodox" theology is the attempt to claim for itself the support of the Reformers. Such an attempt was recently made in regard to Calvin's idea of faith.[1]

The essential point of the question is set forth with force and clarity in the following words, which relate to the noetic element in Calvin's view of faith:

> But it is not such knowledge as we commonly call knowledge. It is not like knowing that there is a tree in the front yard or that the sum of the angles of a triangle equals one hundred and eighty degrees. It is not such knowledge, for its object is not such an object. It lies, to introduce a figure which Karl Heim has used, upon a different dimension. It is knowledge of the divine benevolence. It is knowledge which qualifies all knowledge.[2]

That such a representation of the matter is palpably contradicted by the Reformer's own words is readily granted by the author of the above quotation. He allows that Calvin sometimes "forgets himself and speaks as if the knowledge of faith were of the same sort as other knowledge"; that he "thinks of the precise content of Christian doctrine as if it were the content of faith-knowledge." "But," it is claimed, "when he does this, he moves away from the definition which he has set forth."[3]

A Calvin, of course, may err. But when the charge of erring is of such a nature as this, there is, to say the least, a suspicion that the misunderstanding is not that of the incomparable theologian but rather of this modern interpreter. Let one charge Calvin with faulty exegesis due to the limitations of his own era, or with harboring false

---

1. George Gordh, "Calvin's Conception of Faith," *The Review and Expositor*, April, 1953, pp. 207 ff.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
3. *Loc. cit.*

theological presuppositions handed down from earlier times, or with making any of the common-enough slips that flesh is heir to, and we will listen with respect. But to say that the author of the greatest of Protestant theological treatises was too stupid to perceive such a glaring contradiction in his own writings on a question of the most vital importance is quite another matter.[4]

This modern representation of Calvin is of a piece with much of current theology in its endeavor to deny the doctrinal or propositional quality of the act of revelation. It is denied, in this kind of theology, that the Scriptures contain revealed statements of truth. Rather the revelational act—which, it is contended, necessarily includes the response of faith—is God's confrontation of us with Himself. All of which means that we can make a genuine response in faith and yet express this response in the most widely-variegated doctrinal patterns.

Such a conception is not essentially different from the older liberal view—championed by such men as Fosdick—which regarded doctrinal beliefs as just so many temporary and erroneous thought-forms through which the abiding experiences of religion are to be expressed; although of course in the modern viewpoint the divine initiative is stressed, whereas in the older liberalism man's upward reach toward the divine was emphasized.

Paul Tillich gives a thorough-going application to this principle when he enunciates his restatement of the concept of justification by faith. Tillich would apply the material principle of the Reformation to the intellectual sphere, so that no one would be excluded from justifying faith because of not holding to certain kinds of beliefs. Thus the atheist,

4. So central is the question of faith for Calvin that it has been said, and with considerable reason, "For him, as for Luther, justification by faith is the heart of the Christian faith, and that is why the subject forms the center of the *Institutes* around which all the other doctrines are grouped." Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr., *A Compend of Luther's Theology* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943), p. xiii.

just so he is seriously minded, is really a believer.[5] If, as the quotation cited above maintains, faith is in an altogether different dimension from factual knowledge, then this principle must be followed to the unavoidable conclusion reached by Tillich.

We all certainly realize that faith means much more than mere factual knowledge. The essential thing to be grasped, however, is that while faith extends into a different dimension, it does not lie altogether in this different dimension. That is, in ascending into this higher sphere, faith does not thereby vacate its place in the lower sphere of factual knowledge. The three-dimensional cinema does not exclude the dimensions of height and width. Nor, to use the customary nomenclature, does the dimension of *fiducia* exclude those of *assensus* and *notitia*. The higher factor includes the lower.

Historically Protestant theology in working out its conception of faith has largely directed its labors against Rome, which has shown a tendency to limit faith to the assent of the understanding. Thus there has not been considerable stress upon the elements of understanding and assent.[6] But these elements have always been retained in traditional Protestant thought. Any adequate understanding of faith must embrace these three elements. As Warfield says, speaking of faith in all its manifestations, whether as directed toward Christ or toward some lesser object,

> No true faith has arisen unless there has been a perception of the object to be believed or believed in, an assent to its worthiness to be believed or believed in, and a commitment of ourselves to it as true and trustworthy.[7]

The position of Calvin is that of Protestantism. It is with the fiducial aspect of faith that he is mainly con-

5. Paul Tillich, *The Protestant Era*, trans. James Luther Adams (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), pp. xiv-v, *et passim.*

6. Benjamin B. Warfield, *Studies in Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1932), p. 340.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 341.

cerned. He seeks to combat the notion that faith is "nothing more than a common consent to evangelical history."[8] This fiducial aspect, however, is accompanied by the other factors that must in part constitute faith. Thus the quotation given at the beginning of this paper would be correct in its exposition of Calvin if, instead of saying that faith "is not such knowledge as we commonly call knowledge," it would say that faith is "not only" such knowledge. However richer the quality of Christian faith may be than knowledge that there is a tree in the front yard, such a factual element must at least be included.[9] Calvin's stress on faith as a practical thing has been pointed out by many writers, but to try to turn this into the equivalent of modern existentialism is far wide of the mark.[10]

To show that Calvin's view of faith did in fact involve this factor of knowledge (in the sense in which "knowledge" is usually understood) is no task at all. As has been pointed out, the author of the article under discussion admits that such is the case. But why should it be thought that Calvin could not consistently allow for this factor of knowledge along the fiducial factor? Such a thought can be entertained only upon the supposition that the Genevan Reformer sat at the feet of Kierkegaard, or of Kant, who has really provided the stimulus for the fashion to deny to man any real knowledge of divine things. But Calvin rather sat under

---

8. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, III. ii. 1. trans. John Allen (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), Vol. I, p. 596.

9. He does say that when faith is termed "knowledge," there is intended "not such a comprehension as men commonly have of those things which fall under the notice of their senses." But this he explains to mean that what is apprehended by faith is infinite and thus beyond our full comprehension. The things which we understand through faith are at a distance from us and beyond our sight." Thus "the knowledge of faith consists more in certainty than in comprehension," since this knowledge proceeds from a "persuasion of the veracity of God" rather than any "demonstration of reason." *Ibid.*, III. ii. 14 (Vol. I, pp. 613-614).

10. Cf., e.g., Edward A. Dowey, Jr., *The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), pp. 24 ff.

the writers of the Scriptures, of whom "it is inconceivable," as has justly been said, that they

> even if they could have studied the *Critique of Pure Reason,* would have admitted that they had been mistaken in supposing that their faculties could reach so far as the Divine Being, and could know His purposes of judgment and mercy.[11]

While Calvin emphasizes the fiducial aspect of faith in his combat with the theology of Rome, other features of that theology cause him to assert the noetic quality of faith. In Rome's conception of "implicit faith" there is something of a strange meeting of extremes with current thought; this making what Calvin says in this connection somewhat contemporary with the present question. He asks, "Is this faith—to understand nothing, but obediently to submit our understanding to the Church?"[12] Without of course transferring to the Church "the province of inquiry and of knowledge," much of current theology would in fact make faith to consist in understanding nothing. For Calvin, however, "Faith consists not in ignorance, but in knowledge."[13] And since man is a sinner, this knowledge must be related not just to God but to God in His mediatorial capacity, concerning which God requires of us "an explicit knowledge."[14] On those matters not completely revealed, our knowledge is of course quite limited, and we must not presume to wander beyond the path of what is revealed. Nevertheless, to say "that ignorance combined with humility should, under this pretext, be dignified with the appellation of Faith, is extremely absurd."[15]

God in His mediatorial relation to us, or God in His benevolent capacity, is thus the proper object of saving faith. The disclosure of God's wrath can only cause us to fear. Our faith finds its real object, therefore, in Christ.

---

11. W. P. Patterson, *The Nature of Religion* (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1925), p. 163.
12. Calvin, *op. cit.,* III, ii. 2 (Vol. I, p. 597).
13. *Loc. cit.*
14. *Ibid.,* III. ii. 2 (Vol I, p. 598).
15. *Ibid.,* III. ii. 3 (Vol. I, p. 598).

Since, however, the object of our faith is presented to us in the Biblical record, acceptance of this record is a necessary part of faith. Thus faith is connected "as an inseparable concomitant with doctrine"; it has "a perpetual relation to the word, and can no more be separated from it, than the rays from the sun, whence they proceed."[16] Therefore

> faith is a knowledge of the will of God respecting us, received from his word. And the foundation of this is a previous persuasion of the Divine veracity; any doubt of which being entertained in the mind, the authority of the word will be dubious and weak, or rather it will be of no authority at all. Nor is it sufficient to believe that the veracity of God is incapable of deception or falsehood, unless you also admit, as beyond all doubt, that whatever proceeds from him is sacred and inviolable truth.[17]

While, then, it is to the promise of salvation that faith specifically is related, he would never think of denying "that it is the office of faith to subscribe to the truth of God, whatever be the time, the nature, or the manner of his communications."[18]

Furthermore, to know of God's gracious promise of salvation will be of no advantage to us unless we do in fact rely upon it. Thus there can be no real faith where there is doubt sufficiently strong to cause us to cease relying upon this mercy. Because of our weakness, however, such steadfastness is impossible with us, but must be supplied by the power of God's Spirit. Therefore Calvin's full definition of faith, which was properly seized upon as the thing of central importance by the author of the article to which we have been referring, is as follows:

> it is a steady and certain knowledge of the Divine benevolence towards us, which, being founded on the truth of the gratuitous promise in Christ, is both revealed to our minds, and confirmed to our hearts, by the Holy Spirit.[19]

16. *Ibid.*, III. ii. 6 (Vol. I, p. 601).
17. *Ibid.*, III. ii. 6 (Vol. I, p. 602).
18. *Ibid.*, III. ii. 7 (Vol. I, pp. 602-603).
19. *Ibid.*, III. ii. 7 (Vol. I, p. 604).

Taking this definition in its context, it is utterly incorrect to say that when Calvin makes saving faith involve acceptance of doctrinal truth he "moves away from the definition which he has set forth." Not only does this "knowledge" of the Divine benevolence which is revealed to our "minds" necessarily mean for Calvin that faith is "an inseparable concomitnat with doctrine," but this knowledge, in being "founded on the truth of the gratuitous promise in Christ," is said by him to involve an acceptance of the entire Biblical record as being throughout factually true. While he does "point out the promise of mercy as the peculiar object of faith," yet in asserting this he says that "we deny not that believers embrace and reverse every part of the Divine word."[20] While he says that the "word of God is not received by faith" until "that what the mind has imbibed" has "taken deep root in the heart," he makes the Spirit's "furnishing of the heart with assurance" the completion and sealing of that "communication of knowledge to the understanding."[21] Thus the mere reception of doctrine is not faith, though such must be a part of faith.

In summary, Calvin's view of faith, considered in relation to the matter which has been under discussion, could hardly be better stated succinctly than when it is said in the Abstract of Principles (which stands within the Calvinistic tradition) that saving faith is "the belief, on God's authority, of whatsoever is revealed in His Word concerning Christ; accepting and resting upon Him alone . . ." It is personal acceptance of Christ, "resting upon Him alone," though involving acceptance of the doctrinal content of Scriptures—with particular reference to the message of salvation which centers in Christ.

---

20. *Ibid.*, III. ii. 29 (Vol. I, p. 631).
21. *Ibid.*, III. ii. 36 (Vol. I, pp. 639-640).

SCIENCE AND THE EARLIEST COMMANDMENT

BY CARL TABB BAHNER

The ten commandments often furnish the texts for a series of helpful sermons, and the new commandment (John 13:34), too, is often taken as a text, but how often is a sermon or a Sunday School lesson devoted to God's oldest command to man: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over every living thing that moves upon the face of the earth." (Genesis 1:28)? It is true that God has given later commands which we might say represent more advanced assignments, but his earliest command has not been withdrawn.

The first part of this command is similar to that which was given to the lower forms of living things. Expert biologists and wide-eyed children share the same thrill of awe as they see the vigor and tenacity with which living things carry out this command: myriads of wild flowers covering the hills, millions of trees rising out of steaming swamps or doggedly holding out their limbs against the howling winds on high mountains, cactus and mesquite growing somehow in stony deserts, lichens on the bare cliffs, innumerable swarms of microscopic plants and animals in the sea, the awe-inspiring multitudes of shell fish along the shore, builders of the coral islands, fish which manage somehow to survive and populate the ocean depths thousands of feet below the surface where the unending darkness and terrific pressure would seem to make life impossible. These and countless other creatures demonstrate the power of the primeval commandment written in their nature.

It has been estimated that the human population of the entire earth in the time of Augustus Caesar may have been only a little larger than that of the United States today.[1] The numerical growth of the race, while fairly steady, has been held to a slow pace by disease, famine, and war during much of the period of written history. The rate of increase has become much more rapid during recent centuries. The

1. Julian Huxley, "Population and Human Destiny," *Harper's Magazine*, 201, 38 (September, 1950).

world population of 1.1 billion in 1850 increased to 2.2 billion by 1939 and to 2.4 billion by 1949.[2] This increase seems to be due not to an increase in the birth rate, but to reduction in the death rate as a result of a new understanding of epidemic diseases. For example, Allen points to these reductions in death rates in the United States from 1900 to 1948: "Influenza and penumonia, from 181.5 (per 100,000) to 38.7 in 1948; for tuberculosis, from 201.9 to 30; for typhoid and paratyphoid, from 36 to 0.2; for diphtheria, from 43.3 to 0.4; for scarlet fever, from 11.4 to a small fraction of 0.1—a figure which, in 1948, represented only 68 deaths in the entire country."[3] The life expectancy at birth increased from 49 years in 1900 to 68 years in 1950. The introduction of wide scale spraying with DDT has produced striking reduction in death rate in Ceylon.[4] The population of Egypt, where there has been a partial application of modern knowledge, has doubled in the past fifty years;[5] that of Java tripled from 1860 to 1930; that of Japan increased from 45 million in 1900 to 83 million in 1950; and the present rate of increase of the entire world population is such as to double the population within less than 70 years.[6]

The Genesis commandment to man goes further than that to the lower animals. He is to populate the earth *and to master it.* The two things must go together, for it is by mastering the earth that man can make it support a larger population. To bring children into a land in which they must starve or die in childhood of preventable disease is tragic. For a dictator to urge his people to bring more and more children into a country which he knows is inadequate

2. Such population estimates are only approximate. See *Collier's Encyclopedia,* 1952, XVI, 207; E. B. Reuter, *Population Problems,* J. B. Lippincott Co., New York, 1937 p. 56.

3. Frederick Lewis Allen, *The Big Change,* Harper and Brothers, New York, 1952, p. 202.

4. The death rate dropped in one year from 20.3 to 14.3 per thousand; see Los Angeles *Times,* August 28, 1952, Section 2, p. 4.

5. Elizabeth Monroe, "Behind The Headlines in the Middle East," *New York Times Magazine,* September 14, 1952, p. 9.

6. Samuel Brody, "Facts, Fables, and Fallacies on Feeding the World Population," *Proceeding Federation of Societies for Experimental Biology, II,* 681 (1952).

to feed them, in the hope that they will turn the children of some other nation into cannon fodder and thus make room for themselves, is vicious.

The world can support many times its present population if we will learn how to take full advantage of its resources. We hear it said that the world is crowded, but if every human being on the earth were brought to one meeting place, the average county in the United States could provide standing room for them all, with room to spare. A hermit might grumble that the problems of human relations would be simpler if the world population were so small and families so scattered that no man need live in sight of the smoke from a neighbor's fire, but most of us recognize that the disadvantages of such an arrangement would be greater than the advantages.

The human body consists chiefly of the elements oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, sulfur, calcium, potassium, sodium and chlorine together with traces of iron, iodine, and other elements. Water, composed of hydrogen and oxygen, covers more than 70% of the earth's surface. The atmosphere above each square yard of the earth's surface contains, on the average, roughly seven tons of nitrogen. A cubic mile of sea water contains several hundred times as much sodium chloride as all the human bodies in the world contain. Calcium and potassium are similarly abundant in our environment. Carbon makes up only 0.01% of the earth's crust, but the earth is so vast that this quantity is inconceivably large. The proven phosphate ore reserves of the United States alone are estimated at over thirteen billion tons.[7] In a single year four pounds of sulfur are mined for every human being on the earth.

In addition to building materials the human body requires food for energy. Ultimately this energy comes from the sun: plants use sunlight to convert carbon dioxide and water into energy foods. Fortunately the sun's rays lavish energy upon the earth at the rate of 40,000 horsepower,

7. John A. Timm, *General Chemistry*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1950, p. 481.

day and night, for every man, woman, and child on the globe.[8]

We have the space, we have the necessary elements, and the energy required to support a population far greater than the earth has ever known, yet it is cruelly apparent that millions of people are near starvation today and hundreds of thousands die whenever food crops fail. What is it we lack? We have to learn how to use these resources and to apply that knowledge for the divinely ordered purpose. On a vast, worldwide scale we face the problem of increasing the production of food rapidly enough to meet the needs of a hungry world population which is increasing by 26 million mouths every year. The harvests of the good years must be sufficient to build up reserves to meet the unfavorable weather conditions and new outbreaks of plant diseases and insect pests which bring lean years. Always we must be alert to the danger of adopting methods which, like eating up the seed corn, increase food supply temporarily, but in the long run brings want.

The average thickness of the layer of top-soil in the United States is approximately seven inches. The rate of erosion when the soil is covered by virgin forest is so slow that, even though there is a ten percent slope in the Southern Appalachian Region, over 500,000 years would be required to wash away seven inches of top-soil; but when planted with cotton in straight rows the same erosion would take place in less than fifty years. It has been stated that nearly one-fifth of the good land in the United States has been ruined by erosion, over one-half is imminently threatened, and less than one-third is not seriously threatened.[9]

The growing of corn and wheat on land not suited to that use has resulted in shocking losses by erosion.

Natural sicence is an orderly way of thinking about our physical environment which helps us to understand, predict, and control its behavior. Our understanding is still

8. Eugene Ayres, "Power from the Sun" *Scientific American*, August, 1950, p. 16.

9. Garret Hardin, *Biology: Its Human Implications*, W. H. Freeman & Co., San Francisco, 1952, p. 663.

so incomplete that often we cannot predict with confidence nor control many of the phenomena which are important to our lives. Indeed it seems presumptuous to speak of controlling the forces of nature, but God has commanded man to undertake that task, to subdue the earth, as well as to have dominion over the lower forms of life. It is no light challenge!

How has the scientific search for understanding of the food problem begun to meet the need of our age? "Through the greater use of insecticides, fungicides, and fertilizers, the United States increased its production in the past 15 years by the equivalent of 64 million acres."[10] Data indicates that DDT has increased potato yields 25% and hybrid corn out-yields open pollinated varieties by a similar amount.[11]

At one time the shortage of nitrogenous fertilizers was believed to set severe limits upon the amount of food which the earth can be made to produce, but a painstaking study of the chemistry of nitrogen has led to the development of a cheap method of converting the abundant but inert nitrogen of the atmosphere into fertilizer. Data contained in North Carolina Experiment Station Bulletin No. 366 have been used to show that corn yield can be increased from 28 bushels per acre to 92 at a fertilizer cost of $27.60, more than tripling the food produced per acre (and, incidentally, increasing the farmer's profit even more than three-fold).[12]

Not so generally known is the recent successful use of synthetic urea, readily prepared from synthetic ammonia and carbon dioxide, to take the place of proteins in the diet of cattle. Other promising novel foods are being investigated. Proteins are usually considered the most expensive of the principal types of food material required for growth and health. They are so complex that they defy large scale

10. "The Malthusian Mischief," *Fortune*, May, 1952, p. 96.

11. L. A. Maynard, "Agricultural and Industrial Possibilities of Increasing the Food Supply," *Proceedings of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, II*, 675 (1952).

12. "Advances in Chemical Fertilizer Nitrogen," mimeographed notes presented by George V. Taylor of Spencer Chemical Company at the Southeastern Regional Meeting of the American Chemical Society, Auburn, Alabama, October 24, 1952.

synthesis in manufacturing plants, but fortunately it has been found that in digestion the proteins are broken down into simpler substances called amino acids before they are assimilated by the body. Amino acids can be manufactured artificially in chemical plants and it has been announced recently that one large manufacturer is about to put on the market a synthetic amino acid which can be included in the diet of hungry humans to take the place of part of the scarce protein which they cannot obtain.

The synthetic dye industry, growing from the researches of Perkin and others, has released hundreds of thousands of acres of land from growing indigo and other vegetable dye materials. The growing of tobacco, which was introduced without adequate scientific investigation to the European peoples as an almost miraculous medicinal agent, "herba panacea,"[13] occupies several million acres of fertile soil which may be released for food crops when the public becomes aware of scientific discoveries concerning the relation of tobacco to cancer. The development of synthetic fibers such as rayon and nylon make possible the release of much of the land once devoted to growing cotton for growing food instead.[14] An understanding of the life of the tsetse fly, the carrier of sleeping sickness, and of the organisms which cause the disease has led to practical steps which are opening up large areas of Africa which have not been available for food production. Other medical advances are making it possible to develop areas where yellow fever, malaria, and other diseases have made farming almost impossible.

At the same time that the application of modern scientific knowledge has decreased the death rate it has also made possible better health for the workers. A healthy, energetic worker can grow more food than one who is so weak because of disease and malnutrition that he is hardly able to move. Medical missionaries in equatorial Africa

13. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1943 Edition, XXII, 260.

14. It has been said that one reason for famine in India has been that much fertile land has been devoted to the cultivation of cotton.

have found that many of the natives are simply too weak to cultivate their crops properly.

Are we making progress toward carrying out the first command? Yes. Are we making progress as rapidly as we need to in subduing the earth? NO! The same high birth rates which were necessary to maintain the race in the face of staggering infant and child mortality rates which have prevailed, now threaten to bring famine and death until they are readjusted to meet the new situation. The world is in a time of crisis in which there is a grave question whether the food supply can be increased quickly enough to balance the needs of the multitudes before famine and resulting diseases sweep the earth or hunger goads them into desperation and bloody conflict. "Most of those who were hungry in the five pre-war years are now hungrier . . . Production in most of the undernourished areas is failing to keep pace with population growth . . . This decrease means more undernourished . . . less resistance to disease . . . more funeral processions of those who die young . . . Hunger is still haunting our civilization . . . There will inevitably be also a rising tide of unrest and revolution and war."[15]

Christians must not turn a deaf ear to the cries of the needy, echoing Cain's cynical words, "Am I my brother's keeper?" The scientists who are striving to obtain the knowledge through which the hungry children of the earth may be fed, as well as the missionaries who minister in Christ's name to the multitudes, need your prayers. Pray for them!

---

15. N. E. Dodd, "The Work of the FAO," Report of the Director General, Food and Agricultural Organization of UN, Rome, 1951.

THAT TROUBLESOME 'ALMAH AND OTHER MATTERS

BY WILLIAM A. IRWIN

As one member of the revision committee responsible for the Old Testament section of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, I am grateful for the privilege of saying something, through the pages of *The Review and Expositor,* about our work in preparation of the new version, and in particular of giving some attention to Isaiah 7:14, a passage which, to our astonishment, has been singled out as of prime significance in the translation. I take up the task gladly, since I recognize that I shall thus be collaborating with colleagues whose integrity I respect, and whose scholarly standards and Christian motivation inspire confidence. There are theological differences between Baptists and Methodists—it is the glory of our Protestant heritage to permit and encourage such varied emphases within the immensity of our faith—but our relations well exemplify the old saying that the things in which we are alike are much greater than those in which we differ.

In particular, through recent months I have come to a new respect for the sane, scholarly ideals of Southern Baptists. I have found among them the same rigid search for evidence, the same sincerity, and the same honest quest of truth that is recognized everywhere as a *sine qua non* of scholarly activity. On this ground thoughtful men can with mutual profit discuss their differences quietly and objectively, asking of the other no more than an eagerness to examine relevant facts and to appraise fairly and dispassionately their meaning. Doubtless I should add that I have found here that further mark of the scholarly attitude, a recognition of the relative nature of all scholarly work. Scholarship is merely the application of trained intelligence to specific problems—and human faculties, even at their best are highly fallible. The scholar collects his evidence, carefully weighs its implications, and draws his conclusions. If he is fortunate, he will "settle" the problem; but he knows well that at the best it will remain "settled" only for a time. Soon or late other scholars will raise the issue once

more, and probably then will have evidence that was not available to him, or perhaps will demonstrate that his methods were imperfect. Scholarship has no dogmas and no absolutes, save only the finality of truth, which in its absolute form is forever unattainable. Yet our human plight is such that these fallible methods are our best intellectual guidance. And they suffice. The attainments of science, which even the most reactionary religious thinker is glad to enjoy, demonstrate brilliantly that scholarly methods can and do find truth—even if an incomplete truth.

In turning to Isaiah 7:14 it is of worth to cite first the excellent comment by Professor Francisco in the January issue of *The Review and Expositor;* he notes that the extreme things which have been said about our rendering do not "allow for the fact that the revisers may have been sincerely seeking to reveal the exact meaning of the original Hebrew. We should not allow prejudice and tradition to overrule the proclamation of the truth" (p. 53). I wish to assure all that such was in reality our effort and objective. There is no member of the committee who would claim that our translation is perfect; its character as committee work entails that on practically every one of the thousands of decisions that were taken through those fourteen years, there was a greater or less minority who voted against the prevailing motion, that is, who believed that the action finally taken was wrong. This situation can be readily illustrated from some of Professor Francisco's criticisms. Yet I am convinced that the committee method is best, and the only one possible for a translation such as we sought to achieve. Our disagreements are not an indictment of the competence of the group, but an inescapable aspect of scholarly work. If our numbers had been increased ten-fold—provided so many competent Old Testament scholars could be found—to include even our bitterest critics, in so far as they are capable of serious, objective weighing of linguistic evidence—which obviously the most vociferous of them are not—the result would have been practically the same: a dissident minority on hosts of points, and some resultant

readings, disliked more or less emphatically by numbers of readers. It is impossible to please everybody, just as it is impossible to attain scholarly unanimity.

One thing I wish to emphasize strongly as basic both in the quality of the revision and in the tedious work that was done on it; the Committee, collectively and individually, were completely honest. They held before themselves constantly the three objectives set forth in the resolution by the International Council of Religious Education at its meeting in February, 1937, which constituted the committee. These objectives were a version which, (1) embodies the best results of modern scholarship; (2) is suitable for use in public and private worship; and (3) is in the direction of the simple classic style of the King James. That is what we consistently and honestly tried to do. On the negative side, we were eager and alert to avoid introducing our own ideas into the Bible; we sought always to keep well on the right side of the distinction—which sometimes in actuality wears thin—between translation and interpretation. The ideas of the Biblical writers were the only ones which could be admitted to the translation. Is it then, malicious to comment on an aspect of the most noisy of the criticism to which we have been subjected? One gains the impression that it rests in personal resentment because we did not write into the Bible the critic's favorite theology! That such evaluation rests on some basis of fact is evident in that such folk, either through ignorance or through bias, seldom take account of the linguistic and textual facts which determined our action, but content themselves with horrified ejaculations as to its theological results. Another mark of the scholarly mind, I need not mention to readers of *The Review and Expositor,* is to recognize that theology rests on facts, and specifically the Biblical theologian must be at pains to learn first what the Bible really says.

The relevant evidence on the meaning of the Hebrew word *'almah,* which we translated "young woman" has been so ably adduced by members of Southern Baptist faculty in the January number of *The Review and Expositor* that

there seems little for me to add. Yet that little I do wish to offer, along with some emphasis on the facts already known. First of all, I would re-echo the surprise expressed by the writers to whom I am constantly referring, that our translation should have given rise to such criticism. If our action is susceptible of the far-reaching effects our critics claim, then surely there is occasion to ejaculate, "O you of little faith." Those whose faith in Christ hangs precariously on the rendering of a Hebrew word in a single passage are surely in a sad plight! Actually, as Professor Moody so well notes, Isaiah 7:14 *in its original intent* could have referred only to some event between 734 and 732 B.C.; its application to doctrines of Christology is a totally different matter, having only the most tenuous connection with the issue of whether the *'almah* was a virgin or not. I wish then to warn of what seems to me a patent logical fallacy. The argument runs like this: in every one of its nine (or eleven if we include two commonly accepted emendations) occurrences, the context shows that the *'alm*ah was a virgin; therefore *'almah* means virgin. But let us try out the reasoning with the English phrases; what about this? All virgins are young women, therefore all young women are virgins! In reality the words in Hebrew, as also in English, indicate no more than that there is some overlap of the two terms. If it were demonstrated that in every case the *'almah* was a virgin—and I insist that it is neither demonstrated nor probable—it would not follow necessarily that the two terms are synonymous, but instead we would be confronted with the troublesome question of their precise relationship.

However, this is not our problem, for, contrary to Professor Francisco—I refer to his article in the Christmas number of *Western Recorder*—I am convinced that the evidence fully supports our action in adopting the term "young woman." I must demur at his claim that Hebrew lexicographers ignore the basic importance of usage in determining the force of a word. How does he suppose they arrive at their definitions, then? On the contrary, all lexicograph-

ers proceed on precisely this basis; their first task is to list occurrences of words, then out of these to deduce meanings. If Professor Francisco has at sometime visited the top floor of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, he has seen the process in operation in creation of an Accadian dictionary: a large room full of steel filing cases containing hundreds of thousands of cards listing and annotating Accadian words in their context. This was the method of the Oxford English dictionary also—and so one might run on to the end of the catalogue. Use of the Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew lexicon should have shown that this was likewise their method, for its pages are rich in citation of occurrences of words which then on this basis are defined; this is one of its highly valuable features. Further, and to Professor Francisco's point, in the work of the RSV committee a copy of Mandelkern's concordance to the Hebrew Old Testament lay always at hand, and was in constant use. The etymology of a word is frequently revealing; but words quickly develop away from their original significance, hence we were conscious that usage alone can provide final determination of their force. The remark was frequently voiced that the real Hebrew lexicon is an exhaustive concordance, such as Mandelkern's.

I am considerably puzzled by Professor Francisco's argument that in Isaiah 7:14 "Isaiah did foresee, however dimly, the virgin birth of the Messiah" (*op. cit.* p. 16). There is a sense in which I would fully agree with him, yet so far as I can understand what he has written, this sense is far from his mind. He seems to mean that Isaiah 7:14 is a valid "foreseeing" of the birth of Jesus. Still he points out correctly that the relevance of the oracle was for the crisis of 734 B.C., and must have had some quality that could reasonably have convinced King Ahaz of Isaiah's truth. "It is quite possible," he writes, "that Isaiah spoke this sign in such a way as to give an obvious meaning to Ahaz, and yet leave a more profound significance to be worked out later." But then he dismisses the immediacy of the promised birth, and seeks to relate it entirely to that of Jesus 730 years later.

Yet this is to fly right in the face of the clear Scriptural meaning. The passage has Isaiah declare the imminent birth of a child, who is to constitute in himself the sign which Ahaz needed. We cannot escape the clear conclusion of Professor Moody that Immanuel was a historic character born about 733 B.C. When Professor Francisco goes on to the "more profound meaning" that was to be "worked out later" he is merely raising a problem that has convulsed the entire history of Biblical interpretation, the seeming tension between the literal and the "spiritual," or, as we would now say, the "theological" meanings. That there was "such meaning" I heartily affirm; yet our present concern must be with the literal: what did Isaiah say that could have encouraged faith on the part of King Ahaz in the crisis of 734 B.C., and what then was the immediate sequel of his utterance? If his literal meaning was that a child was to be born 730 years later, then he was both mocking Ahaz in the depth of his crisis, and rendering himself absurd by proposing such a distant event as proof of his own veracity. But indeed the linguistic evidence lends no support to this improbable interpretation. As is generally recognized, the word translated "shall conceive" is an adjective; the clause has no verb. Literally it says, "Behold the *'almah* pregnant"; nothing in the structure tells whether it means that she is, or was or will be pregnant. For this information we must have recourse to other considerations.

The relevant word (in Hebrew *harah*) occurs all told, in singular and plural, sixteen times in the Old Testament. In several of these it is purely adjectival or else has become nominal, especially in its plural form. Our concern is with the eight occurrences where it forms the predicate. Four of these (Genesis 38:24, 25; 1 Samuel 4:19; 2 Samuel 11:5) are in narratives where it is clear that the pregnancy is an accomplished condition; there remain the "annunciation" stories where the word is found in Genesis 16:11; Judges 13:5, 7; and the present passage, Isaiah 7:14. In the first of these it is told that Hagar was already pregnant; this is not clearly stated in regard to Samson's mother, but at the most

her pregnancy was to come in the immediate future. It is relevant to cite the great New Testament annunciation accounts also; though not in Hebrew, it is apparent that they employ the same ritual formula made familiar in these Old Testament passages, and in them we find also the same temporal uncertainty. In Luke's account the pregnancy is a matter of the immediate future, in Matthew's apparently it has already begun. The implications of all this are apparent; it is a fair deduction that when Isaiah spoke of (or to) the *'almah* in 734 B.C., in this word *harah* he was declaring that her pregnancy was not a matter of the distant future, but either had already occurred or else would come about in the very near future. It is of little relevance to mention that for my part I am persuaded that of these alternatives, he meant the latter.

We are thus obliged to come to full agreement with the position presented by Professor Moody that (1) Isaiah promised the birth of a child within a few months; (2) the child was born in the specified time; (3) if this birth was from a virgin, then the uniqueness of that of Jesus is destroyed. Along this line it is probable that most religious persons will dismiss the allegation of virgin birth of the child in Isaiah 7, and with it will by implication have dropped the entire basis of concern for the translation of this verse.

The most consistent attempt to defend the thesis that *'almah* must mean an unmarried young woman, a virgin, is, so far as I know, that of the late Robert Dick Wilson in the *Princeton Theological Review,* xxiv (1926), pages 308-316. The discussion proceeds through an examination of the translation of *'almah* in the ancient versions, the meaning of the root *'alam* in the Semitic languages, a study of translations of a couple of parallel terms, and finally two pages of tabulated conclusions. The evidence of the versions is highly mixed, so as to lend little support to Wilson's thesis. True, in Isaiah 7:14 they are unanimous in rendering virgin, except the two Jewish translations, the Targum and the Greek translation of Theodotion. However, this near unanimity

is less than impressive; the crux of the issue is why the Septuagint read *parthenos*, for it is apparent that the others have been influenced either by this, or else by Christian theology, or by both. Wilson's conclusions are an amazing case of special pleading; as illustrations, these: "An *'almah* must have been presumed to be a virgin, since it is never defined by *bethula*" [virgin]—surely an amazing piece of reasoning! "Since the Peshitto Syriac . . . was probably made by Jews, their rendering . . . *bethula* in Isa. vii. 14 must have been considered proper even as late as the second century A.D." How do we know this, since the Peshitto was revised in accord with the Septuagint, and besides has come to us as a Christian Bible? "'*Almah* in the Old Testament never has this meaning [young married woman] elsewhere." But this is to beg the entire question; for precisely here is the crux of the matter: what is to be fairly deduced from the occurrences and context of the word in the Old Testament? Wilson seems to believe that he has disposed of it by citation of the translations in the ancient versions, but in reality this evidence is secondary and intrinsically dubious. It is gratifying to turn instead to the careful examination of the actual Hebrew usage which is provided in the excellent studies, so often referred to, in *The Review and Expositor;* in accordance with the sort of evidence which they adduce, the matter stands or falls.

I am, however, quite unable to believe that because Song of Songs 6:8 mentions queens and concubines, therefore the third category, called *'alamoth* must be virgins. These alleged "virgins" are in decidedly bad company! More seriously, Hebrew does not limit the relations of a man to the women of his harem to those of wives and concubines; it has a number of words. I see no sound reason why *'alamoth* here is not to be understood as implying some such relation, the precise distinction of which from concubinage and servitude is not clear to us. Further, as Professor Moody has pointed out to me, it is notable that the passage runs on to praise the unique charms of the beloved, then immediately (in vs. 9) has the queens and concubines—apparently the

same as in vs. 8—praise her; with them is linked, just as in vs. 8, a third class of women, here called *banoth* (daughters). It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that here we have a specific interpretation of *'alamoth;* they could be accurately described by the general term "daughters," that is, any young women. It will be recognized then that my view runs directly counter to that of Professor Francisco. The passage seems to demonstrate cogently as Professor Owens has already pointed out, that the *'alamoth* were not necessarily virgins at all; the word means young woman.

I believe the passages about Hebrew music have a relevance for our problem that has not been exploited. We must interpret these facts: I Chron. 15:20, a group of Levites, whose names are given, "were to play harps 'according to Alamoth' (RSV; "with psalteries on Alamoth" KJ); Ps. 46 in the title has the musical direction, "According to Alamoth" (RSV; "upon Alamoth" KJ); Ps. 9, also in the title, has "according to Muth-labben" (RSV; "upon Muth-labben" KJ; Hebrew *'al muth labben*) Ps. 48:14 reads "our guide forever" (RSV; "our guide even unto death" KJ; Heb. *'al muth*). There is cogent ancient support for the view now somewhat generally held that in the Ps. 9 passage the original was *'al 'alamoth labben;* and in Ps. 48 it was *'al 'alamoth* and should be attached to the following Psalm in its musical directions. In any case it is apparent that in I Chron. 15:20 *'al 'alamoth* means "according to *'alamoth*" (i.e. some class of young women): more simply, that the Levites' harps were to be tuned to a high note, what we would call in vocal music, soprano. *'Alamoth,* the plural of *'almah,* is thus used as a designation of music in a higher scale: differing, we might say, from other as women's singing differs from that of men. Do women's voices undergo a profound change at marriage? The question is absurd. It is age, not sex experience that ultimately brings change, and then not a deepening to bass. The *'alamoth* to whom the musicians refer are clearly young women, quite indifferent to their virginity or loss of it. This conclusion is strongly enforced by Ps. 9. If we are to read *'al 'alamoth labben* (and I repeat that there is cogent textual

evidence for it) the phrase seems to mean, "for boys' soprano voices," or closer to the Hebrew, "for boys (who sing) like *'alamoth.*" It is not irrelevant to cite Exod. 15:20 and I Sam. 18:6-7, in both of which a triumphant women's choir was made up, not of *bethuloth* (virgins) nor of *'alamoth* (young women), but of *nashim* (women); clearly there was no prohibition of the prominent participation of married women in such political and religious celebrations. With this we are in position to note that in Ps. 68:26, there were *'alamoth* with their hand-drums in the religious procession, apparently in the Temple. It is patent these were simply "young women"; to invoke the question of their sex experience is to make the passage absurd.

Too often consideration of the usage of this word stops here. But there is yet more evidence from the Old Testament. *'Almah,* everyone with even a smattering of Hebrew will recognize, is merely an entirely normal feminine form of the noun *'elem,* which occurs twice (I Sam. 17:56; 20:22) and is rendered by the King James, "stripling" and "young man," but in both cases by the Septuagint *neaniskos* (young man). In neither case is the context determinative for the matter we seek, although in the former passage it would appear that David was yet unmarried. However a third line of this linguistic evidence is the abstract noun *'alumim,* the condition of being an *'elem* or *'almah.* It occurs in Job 20:11; 33:25; Ps. 89:45; and Isa. 54:4, in every case translated "youth" by both KJ and RSV, except the latter in the Job passages has "youthful vigor." Careful study will, I believe, demonstrate that only by a forced and most improbable process of interpretation can the idea of attainment or lack of sex experience be found in the word; it means simply what the King James says, youth. Reversing the process we thus find that an *'almah* is a female who possesses *'alumim,* that is, youth. In other words she is a young woman, with no qualification whatever as to whether or not she is a virgin.

A second line of evidence employed by lexicographers is etymology, specifically, for the present instance, the force of the word *'alam* and its derivatives in the other Semitic

languages. Wilson devoted a section (slightly less than two pages) to the matter. Unfortunately his survey is quite incomplete—he says nothing, for example, of the fact that in Palmyrene the noun means a harlot—and gives the impression of being weighted toward the conclusions which Wilson was determined to reach. Thus the Arabic *ghalam* has a series of derivatives all centering about the idea of sex desire; Wilson passes over it lightly. However, I do not wish to press the matter, for etymology is, in the end a dubious resource. It will commonly reveal the loose and general idea of a word; but living languages quickly grow away from origins, not uncommonly going the full circle to the opposite of the root meaning. There is little for our purpose here.

The third and final source of evidence is the translation of *'almah* in the ancient versions. We have seen that Wilson devotes a major part of his study to this. At first glance it would appear that these ancient translators can settle the matter for us; for they stood much closer to the spoken Hebrew of the Old Testament, and may be presumed to have had sources of information now lost. Besides, the Targums and the Syriac are linguistically so close to Hebrew that one is tempted to postulate a special knowledge on the part of their translators. But any such advantages quickly dissipate on close examination. Inconsistencies reveal that the translators' methods were not of the precise sort our present question demands. Further, as indicated above, they were subject to extraneous influences: those of theological dogma, and of the precedent set by the Septuagint. When the Christian versions somewhat consistently translate the word in Isaiah 7:14 by their equivalents for virgin, and when the Jewish carefully avoid this, we are justified in speculating that presuppositions have been at work, probably in both cases. Further, the Septuagint became the great Christian Bible of all the lands about the eastern end of the Mediterranean; its influence was profound; from it other translations were made. Quite clearly, then, the one serious issue relevant to the versional renderings of *'almah* is the Septuagintal use of *parthenos* in Isaiah 7:14.

But there is little for me to add to what Professor Moody has already set forth. He has shown effectively that the Greek word is not an exact equivalent of either English "virgin" or Hebrew "*'almah*," hence its presence in this passage is devoid of evidence that the Septuagintal translators understood *'almah* to mean virgin. Yet the question still remains, why did they use this word instead of *neanis*, which is their equivalent of *'almah* in Exod. 2:8; Song of Songs 1:3; 6:8, and is favored, we may say in Prov. 30:19 (actually the reading is *en neoteti*)? It will be borne in mind that we do not deal with a single group of Septuagintal translators, but with independent workers through many years, evidently a century or more. Hence the differences may in part represent personal preferences. Still there are a couple of relevant remarks to offer. Apparently *parthenos* was chosen in the Genesis passage because the story had already stated that Rebecca was a virgin; the reading was factually accurate, if not linguistically. But certainly a similar explanation for Isaiah 7:14 is not available. It is a unique problem. I offer a suggestion with no claim to finality, but believing it merits consideration. The Targum is no help, for it uses the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew word. Mediaeval Jewish commentators are very late for our purpose, yet it is significant that some of them regarded the *'almah* as one of the women of the harem, a view then developed into the belief that she became the mother of Hezekiah. This harem theory finds some support in Song of Songs 6:8, as it was discussed above. The two together provide basis for a conjecture—I would be first to insist that conclusive evidence is lacking—that the *'almah* was a definite young woman in the king's entourage on this fateful day, whom Isaiah addressed in person with the astonishing prediction that she was to be the mother of Immanuel. This would explain two perplexing features of the verse; the definite article (*ha 'almah*) is thus seen to be a vocative; also the strange verbal forms (for, "shall bear," and "shall call") immediately become lucid when vocalized as second person feminine perfect. The young woman, then, was a special woman, whom Isaiah

singled out as a sort of sacred woman to become mother of the wonder child. This religious, or cultic, aspect of the word thus would correspond to well-known uses of Greek *parthenos;* Athene was the perennial *parthenos.* I offer it as a suggestion that the translator here had an inner understanding of Isaiah's meaning, and chose the correct word to suggest it. The *'almah* was not a virgin, nor just any young woman, she was a specially indicated and religiously "devoted" young woman, a *parthenos.*

This view is strongly enforced by a passage in the Ras Shamra literature which Cyrus Gordon published some years ago (BASOR 65, 1937, pp. 31-32; *Ugaritic Literature;* Rome: 1949, pp. 63-64), the relevance of which to Isaiah 7:14 he has recently discussed (*Journal of Bible and Religion* xxi, 1953, p. 106). The text deals with the marriage of the lunar deities; the relevant passage, according to Gordon, is:

> "A virgin (*bethulah*) will give birth . . .
> Lo, a maid (*'almah*) will bear a son."

With whatever proper reserve is demanded in the light of our still very incomplete knowledge of the Ugarit literature, one may cautiously deduce that by reason of the very close relations between the Canaanite and the Hebrew cultures, this passage is of great importance in an approach to the problem of Isaiah 7:14. It would appear that the annunciation formula in the Bible had a long pre-history in Canaanite ritual, and when Isaiah used it he did so conscious of this and of the overtones of the words he uttered. Just as in the case of Athene, the Canaanite bride was by dogma "a virgin": as often as the sacred marriage was consummated, she came to it ostensibly as a *bethulah.* It is clear that the word has little revelance to our ideas of virginity, but describes only a postulated ritual attribute. Further, the use of *'almah* in parallelism serves as a commentary on this word. The *'almah,* so far as this passage shows, was, in Canaanite thought, a female who took a leading part in the cultic enactment of the divine marriage. "Virginity" was ascribed, but was not necessarily real, in fact probably was not. If

I mistake not, Gordon's brief note indicates the same view as I have here set forth with more detail.

This somewhat lengthy discussion may be regarded as an *apologia pro vita sua* of just one member of the committee. Yet I am convinced that while written independently, it represents approximately the opinion of most, if not all my colleagues. As I recall the session in which Isa. 7 was studied, this verse went through without comment, in the form in which the first reviser had submitted it; for we all recognized that "young woman" is the meaning of the Hebrew word. But doubtless it may be asked, "Then what about that footnote?" In reality, I am at a loss to answer, for it also went through with little if any discussion. I offer the opinion that it was a sort of concession to tradition, which only since publication we have realized was entirely wrong. What the note should have said, the only thing it could with accuracy say, was "Gk Syr Vg virgin." However, two points I wish to emphasize. First, there was no theological bias in the committee's work, but only a sincere effort to tell clearly and fairly what the Biblical writer said. Whether or not the reader is convinced by my argument that *'almah* is rightly rendered "young woman," at least I hope I have given him basis to respect the scholarly sincerity of the translation. And second, this matter has been exaggerated out of all proportion to its significance, so that one is prone to speculate that the ultimate motivation of the criticisms—I do not mean in every individual, but "ultimate" in the sense of the original impelling motivation of the propaganda that has arisen—lay not in religious concern, but in a desire to make a case against the version as a whole, and to use it as a pretext for an abusive attack on the National Council of Churches.

I wish to move on now to an examination of the criticisms advanced by Professor Francisco in his article, already so often referred to, in the January number of *The Review and Expositor*. I do so with pleasure. It is almost an offence—for which I hope he will pardon me—that I should, even in contrast, link his criticisms with the ignorant

nonsense that goes about here in the Southwest, meriting not a word of reply except in so far as sincere people are being troubled and misled by it. But Professor Francisco's criticisms are advanced with a scholar's constant reference to relevant facts in the long history of the Bible and in the problems of translating it. He recognizes, as does every thoughtful person, that the test of a version is not its conformity to or deviation from certain theological presuppositions, but purely and simply how accurately and well it tells in suitable English what the Bible actually says. On this basis we are in complete agreement; such divergence as may manifest itself relates to details where the question may arise whether the committee or else Professor Francisco perhaps erred in judgment.

I shall not discuss fully the passages he has cited in support of his views. There are two major charges he has advanced; I wish to deal with them, employing some of his illustrations; then a few other points will perhaps also merit attention. Those charges are: (1) that the committee has read its bias into the translation, specifically in messianic passages; and (2) that it has not manifested adequate respect for the Hebrew text. The first is damning; the second also is serious. They must be faced fairly.

The entire motivation of the version lay in a conviction that the Bible is relevant, and important for our age. This could be expanded with remarks that would quite rightly run over into something approximating homiletics: the vitality of the Bible through all ages, the confusion and fears of our time, the inadequacy of the English translations current when the revision was inaugurated; and so on. But all coheres in the basic conviction that the Bible has something of vital importance to say to our age. This then found formulation in the resolution, already summarized, of the International Council of Religious Education at its meeting in February, 1937. Its three basic principles were the committee's entire commission. There were no strings attached; there were no sinister designs. The entire purpose was to fill the need of our time for a satisfactory version of the

Bible, marked by scholarly respectability, by religious worth, and by literary power. In that threefold commission is comprised everything that the committee consciously and consistently strove through fourteen years to accomplish. If Professor Francisco wishes to use the word "bias" in reference to the committee's work, then there is our bias: we were "biassed" toward this three-fold objective—and toward no other. That we read our personal theologies into the translation, that we permitted personal whims, of whatever sort, to determine our rendering, simply is not true. All of us were constantly alert to the distinction between translation and interpretation, and insistent that the latter was no part of our task; we were commissioned to tell in English only what the Biblical original says. In fact the tedious argument of those years, with their thousands of issues, and with disagreements that not infrequently assumed the form of heated debate, all reduces to just two questions. We debated what the original actually means, and how that meaning can be best rendered in English. At risk of repetition and over-emphasis, I repudiate completely Professor Francisco's charge that certain of our renderings were "biassed." We sought only for the truth. In particular he believes this mood manifests itself in regard to messianic prophecy. That would be strange, indeed; for I am confident there is not a single member of the entire committee who doubts the reality of messianic prophecy in the Old Testament—I say I am confident; I can say no more, for as a matter of fact we never discussed theological views. Our concern was more detailed; we were engrossed in the minutiae of passage after passage as we moved on through the several books.

Professor Francisco's first case in point relative to our alleged anti-messianic bias is Micah 5:2; we said, "whose origin" instead of "whose goings forth." I confess not a little astonishment that any theological issue can be detected here at all. "Origin" does not at all mean "being born," but merely the place or time or circumstance from which something comes out. In fact I venture the opinion that the theological

overtone claimed for the older rendering is really better served by the word "origin"; it suggests St. Paul's doctrine of the pre-existent Christ. But let me hasten to add that such implication was not our motivation: that would have been just as reprehensible as the course with which we are charged. The explanation is very simple. "Goings forth" is not English at all, but a slavish Hebraism; "origin" expresses, as fully as the inherent impossibility of the translator's task permits, just what the Hebrew says.

A similar consideration relates to Zech 13:7. "Fellow" has lost its respectability since the 17th century; now it is either derogatory or colloquial, and in the latter case has a sense quite different from that meant by the King James. "The man who stands next to me," while unfortunately much heavier, expresses reasonably accurately the meaning of the Hebrew. Also it is approximately of the same force as the old word "fellow." In Zech 12:10 Professor Francisco invokes messianic meaning. I am, myself, extremely dubious of it. But this is of no importance. I am quite astonished that he wishes to go the length of identifying this alleged messiah with Yahweh himself. That is a bold course, completely without support. The action of the committee was taken purely in the interest of making sense. The Hebrew of the passage is very strange. Theodotian's translation provides valid evidence which must not be dismissed lightly (cf. John 19:37; Rev. 1:7). Its use seems to me to offer the least objectionable solution of a troublesome bit of Hebrew. Most of all, however, I am astonished that Professor Francisco wishes to retain the translation "kiss the son" in Psalm 2:12. That the psalm is messianic every scholar recognizes; but this does not mean that one should drag in extreme and indefensible allusions. That the Aramaic word for son is here introduced into this otherwise perfectly normal Hebrew poem, which only five verses earlier had used the Hebrew word, is just out of serious consideration. And citation of *ra 'a* in vs. 9 is of no cogency, for it is well-established Hebrew. Why should we make the messianic teaching of the Old Testament absurd by straining for for impossible al-

lusions? Then I am not one bit more kindly toward the advocated traditional reading in Psalm 45:6, "Thy throne, O God." I grant freely that this is one possibility as a literal rendering; also that the versions provide no variant. But the old principle of the harmony of Scripture is valid, and in a deeper sense than perhaps was invoked in earlier times. It is a fair presumption that the Hebrew writers were rational beings, that their chosen theme in any literary creation was followed with some sort of consistency; hence this theme can serve as an index of the general purport of the several parts of the composition. This psalm is clearly a celebration of a royal marriage; that does not necessarily mean that it is not messianic, but only that its primary theme is of the royal nuptials. The address in vs. 6 is to the monarch—whether messiah or not; it is his throne, not God's that is described. If I mistake not, Professor Francisco would agree on all this, except he is quite certain that the passage is messianic, and further, that the Messiah was here called "God." Our rendering he considers "very doubtful." Let us see.

It is granted freely that "throne" is not in construct relation to "God"; the suffix makes that quite impossible. The Hebrew says literally, "Your (or, thy) throne God eternity and ever"; it is a "nominal sentence": there is no verb at all. The translator must decide by the best evidence he can bring to bear what form of the verb "to be" is relevant, and where it should be placed. Since the context relates in the main to the present, apparently "is" will be correct in this verse. But then it is equally possible to say "Your throne is God," or, "Thy Throne, O God, is," or even "Your throne! God is forever and ever." Since *'elohim* is used at times as a sort of superlative, it is by no means "very doubtful" to believe that such is its force in this passage and that the words say, "Your throne is God" i.e., is a throne of God, a divine throne.

The matter, it will be seen, depends ultimately on one's understanding of the psalm as a whole. It is a royal psalm; the difference between that and a "messianic" psalm wears thin in the light of recent research. The crucial issue is whether the Old Testament Messiah was divine. I do not

presume to speak for my colleagues—as I have stated, we did not discuss theological issues—but I am quite ready to re-affirm for my own part the conviction that Professor Francisco's identification of the Messiah with God himself simply is not an Old Testament idea. To invoke it in translation of this Psalm is contrary to all sound methodolgy. Christological doctrines have nothing to do here. Our Christian concept of the person of Christ grew out of Old Testament messianism, but the two are distinct, just as Judaism and Christianity are not the same thing, intimately related though they are. Old Testament ideas must be understood in and by themselves. The Old Testament never identifies the Messiah with God himself. Doubtless Professor Francisco will consider that this is a matter for debate. Very good! What I am saying is that by as sound and objective methods of investigation as I am able to command, I am convinced that in the Old Testament the Messiah is not divine, and certainly is never identified with the Lord himself. If this passage stated unequivocally such a view then I would be obliged to qualify my opinion to that extent; but the wording being what it is, we must of necessity invoke our best conception of the thought of the time in effort to find what the passage really says. This is not a case of introducing "biasses" or presuppositions; it is merely making use of the best knowledge available. But be that as it may, the point I am stressing is that the Committee were completely sincere and honest in their effort to understand and to render faithfully the Old Testament, specifically this passage in Psalm 45. There is room to question whether they always took the right course in their application of available resources, but any charge of "bias" or insincerity is completely false.

However, the course of our thought is forcing us onward to an examination of Professor Francisco's second charge: that we lacked respect for the Hebrew text. Again we must seek some perspective. I do not suppose there is any thoughtful student of the Hebrew Old Testament, however conservative he may be, who denies that the text has

suffered in transmission. Indeed, this situation is testified by the variants that exist, both within the Hebrew tradition itself and in the considerable spread represented by the deviations of the versions. That "competent Old Testament scholars have always been able to translate and exegete the passages as received" means little. Not uncommonly their course is obviously a counsel of despair, as could be richly illustrated from the King James, where readings are given that rest upon utterly bad Hebrew. In other words, they are not translations at all, but the guesses of the translators who found themselves in the predicament of being obliged to say *something* when the real meaning was impossible to discover. Further, Biblical exegesis has not infrequently in its long course run off into vagaries of fancy, even in the hands of allegedly "competent Old Testament scholars." That demonstration of corruption is not always easy, also that error has been charged where later study has vindicated the traditional text, I gladly affirm. Yet in the end there is no escape from admitting that in a greater or less number of passages the Hebrew is wrong, even when we have no help from the versions in correcting it. This situation constitutes, it will be recognized, one of the basic and very difficult problems confronting the translator.

One rule was that emendations might be accepted on the basis of the versions, but conjectural emendations very sparingly. I believe I am strictly accurate when I state that we followed the rule honestly and consistently, notwithstanding Professor Francisco has counted "approximately 300 corrections of this [latter] type." At some of these we shall take a look. But it is desirable to recognize that by textual "conjecture" is not meant a wild guess of some errant fancy, but rather the use of *evidence* other than that of the versions—and it should be realized that the use of the versions is never objective, but always is finally subject to just this same "conjectural" appraisal. Here then are some of the readings of RSV, that allegedly indicate "a dangerous subjectivity."

Genesis 38:5. "She was in Chezib." A note says, "Heb *He.*" But we were excessively generous with our critics, for

we could truthfully have said, "Gk: Heb *He.*" Moreover the occasional disagreement of subject and verb in Hebrew perhaps renders even this concession unnecessary. It is, to my mind, highly probable that the Hebrew itself means just what we said, and we needed no note at all.

Genesis 24:67. "Isaac brought her into the tent." A note says "Heb adds *Sarah his mother.*" Professor Francisco pertinently queries, "How do we know . . . that Hebrew had added . . .? The LXX has this phrase also." But careful! LXX attests only "his mother," that is, three of the six Hebrew consonants. So here is half an answer! He is conscious of the difficulty of translating "the tent of Sarah his mother," but he fails to point out it is quite impossible with the article on "tent." He defends this rendering, however, on the ground that "Sarah his mother" is in apposition. That would mean that she and the tent were one and the same! An entirely defensible linguistic structure would be to regard "Sarah his mother" as accusative after the verb of motion: "he brought her into the tent, to Sarah his mother." But the course of the narrative makes clear that Sarah had been dead for some years. Did Isaac welcome his bride by introducing her to the mummy of his mother? RSV took the only possible course, so at least it seems to me.

An important matter is entailed in the criticisms of our renderings of Psalms 49:20 and 108:1. We were not commissioned, or in any way obliged to translate the Kittel Bible or even the Ben Chaim text in any of its numerous subeditions. Since there is no critical text of the Old Testament, we dealt with a somewhat nebulous entity which may be called the textual tradition; it comprises the total of our Hebrew evidence. Where superior manuscript evidence diverged from the Kittel text, it was still the Hebrew of the Old Testament, and required no note. This course was taken numerous times; these two passages in the Psalms are good illustrations. The Kittel Bible provides a convenient *apparatus criticus;* reference to the third edition—to go no further for support—shows that the readings we adopted were supported in the first case by "very many manuscripts," and in the second by five.

Something similar relates to the comment on Psalm 73:1. The Hebrew tradition is primarily the consonantal tradition. The massoretic notes, including the division of the consonants and their vocalization and accentuation, are generally right, but they have no authority beyond what they can command by intrinsic worth. There was then no need to append a note telling that a word had been taken as two. I do not recall the discussion in regard to "dropping *'elohim* from the text"; but quite possibly it was not "dropped" at all, but instead our reading was adopted in the interests of English style. It would have been very strange to have said, "God is good to the upright, God to those who are pure in heart." In Daniel 9:24 I must differ from Professor Francisco; the phrase "Seventy weeks of years" is both warranted and justifiable. The word means a period of seven, generally seven days, but not so limited, as reference to the lexicons will demonstrate.

I have just a few comments on our alleged wrong use of paraphrase. It is recognized that while translation differs from paraphrase, yet the latter device is sometimes demanded for clarity. The charge then relates mainly to the cases cited. In Genesis 3:16 we did not parahrase at all, but translated the Hebrew. This is one of the numerous cases where we recognized the existence of hendiadys as a valid Hebraic structure. "Pain and conception" really means "painful conception," obviously not in the sense of its inception, but of its course and culmination. Our rendering is correct and exact.

I fail totally to find the "great freedom" of which we are guilty in Genesis 12:5. English style employs subordination much more than does Hebrew, where the incessant *waw* clauses are a problem for the translator. That they can and should frequently be subordinated is recognized, I believe, by all students of the Old Testament. I am in similar perplexity to discover the importance of the issue entailed. Surely Abram "reached his destination" just as fully in the clause, "when they had come to the land of Canaan" as in the older more slavish wording.

Professor Francisco charges as "one of the most objectionable features" of the version that emendations were adopted without any note of the fact. Several of his illustrations I have examined already: Pss. 49:20; 73:1; 108:1; Daniel 9:24. However, I do not wish to deny his charge in toto, but only its implication. As a matter of fact I have myself drawn official attention to passages where a needed note did not appear; I am confident that similar contributions from him would be welcomed. It is, I hope, understood that in contrast to former versions, the committee for this one is permanent, and its task unfinished. Already numerous corrections have been introduced into printings subsequent to the first. And much more will be done. At risk of tedious repetition, I emphasize that no one claims the version to be perfect. Contributions and suggestions from anyone competent to make them have all along been invited, and still are. All sane criticisms will be given the serious attention they deserve; the other sort, can well be ignored.

I have dealt only with a selection of Professor Francisco's examples, as he in turn, doubtless, has given only a sampling of what he believes he can find. I have been primarily concerned to present the principles and methods of the committee. I hope I have said enough to convince the reader that we were nothing more or less than a group of scholars sincerely trying to perform as best we could a very difficult task. Scholars like all others, are fallible; the fact that the committee's decisions were seldom unanimous is ground for supposing that sometimes they were wrong. No one claims that the version is perfect—it has good company: no other ever was! But such errors as time and study may uncover came about solely through the honest effort to find and take the right course. Further, I have no hesitation in claiming that whatever its shortcomings, RSV is the best English Bible at present in existence.

Then may I be permitted one last rejoinder to Professor Francisco, in the entirely cordial temper in which all this has been written? I must take emphatic exception to his concluding summary that ASV is "far more reliable from

the textual viewpoint" so that "when the reader cares to do more serious study of the Bible" he will be well advised to turn away from RSV. Is ASV more reliable in I Samuel 13:1; in 13:21; in 14:41; in Genesis 4:8; in Ezekiel 6:4; in Proverbs 26:23? And so on and on. These passages illustrate a variety of aspects of the "reliability" of the two versions. In addition I have already dealt with several of the alleged cases of the error of RSV. If Professor Francisco defines reliability as slavish adherence to Hebrew when it is admittedly and patently wrong, and if his view will overlook translations of Hebrew words which the advance of knowledge has shown to be wrong, then he has enough evidence to make some sort of case. But if "reliability" is to be understood in terms laid down by the guiding principle of the new version to take account of the best scholarly results of our time, on text and lexicography, then the superiority of RSV needs no defense.

Book Reviews

Time and Eternity. By W. T. Stace. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952. 169 pages. $3.00.

Professor Stace of Princeton University has here made a highly interesting effort to wed religion with naturalism in such a way as to insure that there will be no future divorce. The real point of departure is oriental mysticism and Stace's desire is to justify what James called the "mystic germ," which is found in greater or less degree in every man, though supremely in the mystic saints.

There are two orders: time and eternity (or natural and divine). Each order is wholly self-contained. The natural order of the temporal can be conceptually analyzed and scientifically studied, with no categories applicable but those of naturalism. The eternal order can only be intuited, and no concepts nor naturalistic categories apply. In the mystic moment these two orders intersect. Looked at from within, this moment is eternal, characterized by union with the divine, and the everyday world seems only half real or even illusory. Looked at from without, from the standpoint of the scientific observer, this moment is merely another moment in time, caught up within the meshings of the space-time order, subject to naturalistic interpretations which reduce its "divinity" to illusion. And both ways of looking are legitimate and right, each in its own way. The one universe can be either intuited in mystical experience or understood by rational scientific-philosophical thoughts. But the two methods should never be mixed. The only factual world is the natural world. All propositions about the divine are to be understood as mere symbolism, including the statement "God exists."

God, then, is wholly other. His infinity means "that than which there is no other." No concepts really apply. He has no internal nor external relations. He is the inherently ineffable, the essentially incomprehensible. To the conceptualizing intellect of the finite mind, he is Non-being, Nothing; but his positive nature, while hidden to the intellect, reveals itself in the intuitive experience. But to say that he is above all possible concepts, means that mystical experience is not experience *of* God. Such a subject-object relation is only applicable to a mind and its concepts and is wholly transcended in the divine. God is just another name for the mystical experience itself, in all its unity.

With all its merits—and they are many—it is doubtful that this interpretation of religion will carry conviction with either the

religious or the philosophical. For the religious man it says too little and for the philosopher too much. Stace has a hard time being true to his insistence that no positive information about God is possible. Using the traditional language of religion, he sometimes seems to become hypnotized by his own words. He manages to state about God more than he has any right to know on his own premisses. To speak of God's "self-knowledge" or His "self-consciousness" becomes rather misleading when we remember that "God" is just another name for the mystical experience itself. The argument carries religious conviction in direct proportion as its true intention is obscured. C. G. Rutenber

Man's Freedom. By Paul Weiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950. 325 pages. $5.00.

The brilliant and individualistic Professor Weiss of Yale University has given us a brilliant and individualistic work on ethics. The jacket says it is profound and original, and so it is. Its provocative treatment of perennial problems will nourish discussion for some time.

Professor Weiss believes in freedom of choice and a genuinely creative will. He will not even permit character determinism, for there is never a time when a man is so conditioned by his past that his next move is certainly in a predictable direction. Freedom of choice is possible because there is a middle ground between a necessitating reason and the absence of all reason, namely, the act of producing a reason. "Could any but a free man . . . say significantly that all men are in the iron grip of conditions within and without?" (p. 62) One is reminded of George Buttrick's clever thrust: the defender of determinism believes that all is determined—except the brilliant argument by which all this is proved!

Professor Weiss believes in the objectivity of values. Since the world we daily confront is permeated with values, the denial that they are really there is tantamount to saying that the nature we daily know is an illusion, man-infected and man-distorted. The believer in the mere subjectivity of values presupposes 1) "that the sciences do not and should not deal with values; 2) that what . . . fluctuates with time, place, civilization, is not an objective fact in nature; 3) that knowledge which is emotionally tinged or grounded is necessarily irrelevant . . . ; 4) that so far as something is relevant to our interests it is not part of nature; 5) that what has meaning in relation to man has no analogous meaning in relation to other beings; 6) that what is relational is not part of nature; 7) that what is private is entirely other in nature and being from what is common." Weiss argues down all seven suppositions in the interests of maintaining that everything in the universe has its good, its excellence, its value.

The ethical relativist assures us that however we may abstractly define the good, in actuality there are no specific ethical norms which are universal. The relativist is wrong, but not wholly wrong. There is an absolute standard which may be known without being known in detail, and hence general principles have diverse and even sometimes conflicting illustrations. Further, there is one "wrong" that is universally and everywhere acknowledged. Everywhere and at all times the wanton slaughter of friends is condemned.

Weiss begins with a "wrong" instead of a "right" because he believes that men are clearer on what ought to be avoided than what ought to be pursued. We can come to a knowledge of the right from the wrong. So Weiss takes this simple, universally held proposition that it is wrong to kill a friend wantonly and makes it the certainty on which the whole of ethical rests! In a closely knit argument, Weiss defends the significance of this proposition and extracts from it the following truths: 1) It is absolutely wrong to injure a befriendable being wantonly; 2) it is absolutely wrong to injure a good being; 3) it is absolutely wrong to reduce the value of a being; 4) it is absolutely wrong to reduce value. And with this last we are on our way to building ethical patterns of conduct.

There are, of course, minor points of disagreement which might be raised. But as an exercise in philosophic ethics, this is one of the finest, most rewarding books this reviewer has read in many a day. I recommend it with great enthusiasm.

C. G. Rutenber

Reformation Writings of Martin Luther. Vol. I; The Basis of the Protestant Reformation. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 402 pages. $6.00.

Few men have discovered the gospel as fully or expounded it so vitally as did Martin Luther. No man is more rewarding of study than this Oak of Saxony. Any project to present him to English readers is commendable.

Dr. Bertram Lee Woolf is well known in this country especially for his translation of the Lietzmann volumes. In this volume of Luther's earlier writings, Dr. Woolf gives a new translation into English from the definitive Weimar Edition of Luther's *Works*. Besides the General Introduction, each translated document is accompanied with Introduction and Notes. There are several useful Indexes—and an Appendix giving a chronological table of Luther's writings (to December 1520) and of contemporary events.

The documents included in this volume are the following: *The Ninety-five Theses* (and some related letters); *A Short Exposition of the Decalogue, Apostles' Creed, and Lord's Prayer; Appeal to the German Nobility; The Babylonish Captivity of the Church*; *Open*

Letter to Pope Leo X; and *The Freedom of the Christian.* The central importance of these writings for the launching of the Reformation is well known. They fall between October, 1517 and November, 1520—years fraught with destiny-making events. Other volumes are to follow.

Luther studies in this generation have taken something of a new turn and are once more in sharp focus in the world-theological scene. Karl Holl perhaps did more to launch this "Luther-Renaissance" than any other. The Luther-Volume of his *Collected Essays,* ought by all means to be translated into English. Holl's work has been followed up and extended in both Germany and Scandinavia. It is good that there is, apparently, a group of English scholars of the newer generation taking more than ordinary interest in Luther. Philip S. Watson of Handsworth College, Birmingham, and E. Gordon Rupp of Richmond College, Surrey, are two such scholars. Watson's *Let God Be God!,* is a helpful study of Luther's theology. Rupp's splendid little *Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms* is being followed right now with *The Righteousness of God,* which will be a major contribution to the English literature on Luther's thought.

All good wishes to Dr. Woolf, the translator, and to the publishers for this fine and useful project. **T. D. Price**

Holy Communion and Holy Spirit. A Study in Doctrinal Relationship. By J. E. L. Oulton. London: S. P. C. K., 1951. 202 pages. 15s net.

Believing that there is a connection between the doctrine of the Holy Communion and that of the Holy Spirit, Canon Oulton has undertaken the difficult task of supplying a need for such a work which demonstrates that connection and at the same time has attempted to lead us to a further study along these lines. His study is largely confined to the teaching of the New Testament but references are made to the doctrine and liturgical practice of the early Church.

Oulton follows the summary statement of Yngve Brilioth who distinguishes three chief ways in which the element of mystery in the eucharist is apprehended; namely, the Synoptic mystery-type, the Johannine mystery-type and the Pauline type. He does not accept the view of Brilioth on the Pauline type. Oulton argues that the eucharist does not make us members of the mystical body, the Church and partakers of the "presence" in the sense that we are not members of the body and indwelt by Christ independently of reception of the elements at Holy Communion. This, he goes on to point out, runs counter to the general Pauline teaching that all members are partakers of the Holy Spirit not on certain occasions only but as long as they do not banish him by wilful sins. To these three views of Brilioth, Oulton adds a fourth which is an eschatolo-

gical type of eucharistic teaching of the New Testament presented by Luke in the shorter text of his account of the Last Supper and in Acts.

In his discussion of the relationship between Holy Baptism and Holy Communion Oulton states that "Holy Baptism is the means of entry into the divine life of the church, or into the life of the Holy Spirit. Holy Communion is the means of renewing that life or more exactly of renewing our union and fellowship with Christ" p. 141. When Oulton comes to the theological problem of the relationship between the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the eschatological hope of a "Second" Coming, he does not turn to Schweitzer nor Dodd. From Paul's epistles he shows that the conviction of an indwelling presence is to be found side by side with the hope of a "future" or "nearer" presence without there being any indication of inconsistency of antinomy which called for an explanation or resolution. Oulton contends that the two sides of mysticism, the present possession and the goal, have not always been comprehended or held together by all mystics. It could be that at this point Oulton has given to us a more sane view of the eschatological hope in its relation to every day living. His thesis deserves careful consideration from all communions. Taylor C. Smith

The American Church of the Protestant Heritage. By Vergilius Ferm. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 481 pages. $6.00.

Professor Vergilius Ferm may be called the most productive editor of theological symposia in the contemporary American scene. For more than twenty years he has steered valuable volumes into print from the minds and desks of his collaborators. (*An Encyclopedia of Religion,* 1945, I have found to be an especially valuable book of ready reference).

Following the "Editor's Preface," there are twenty-one chapters—each given to a major church group in America. These include: Moravian, Lutheran, Mennonite, Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, Reformed, Unitarian, Congregational-Christian, United Presbyterian, Friends, Brethren, Evangelical and Reformed, Methodist, Universalist, United Brethren, Adventists, Disciples, Churches of Christ, and the Church of God. The chapter on the Baptists is ably and succinctly done by Robert G. Torbet.

A general pattern is traceable in the framework of the essays. "Each expositor has tried to make plain the characteristic features of the denomination in terms of its chief doctrines, confessional bases, its theological developments, its type of polity, its larger organizational constructs, its pioneer leaders, its conspicuous theologians and other pertinent data such as American headquarters, schools, journals, and the like."

Written in historical perspective, the book repays reading throughout, and will be useful for repeated reference.

T. D. Price

The Foundations of the Christian Faith. By J. N. Sanders. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. 199 pages. $3.75.

The primary aim of the author of this book has been both academic and practical. He desires to aid the student of the New Testament and the general reader to appreciate the methods, principles, and limitations of historical criticism. Sanders in his preface states that this book owes its origin to some popular lectures which he delivered in 1946. While he was preparing the material for publication, Bishop Barnes' book, *The Rise of Christianity,* came off the press. Parts of this book are devoted to refutation of certain views presented by Bishop Barnes. In my opinion Sanders has been too greatly concerned about the arguments of Barnes. Most of the views of Barnes are so weak that there should have been no attempt to refute them.

In his introduction Sanders says that one may follow two possible plans in a study of the teaching of the New Testament. One plan is more appropriate to the exposition of a philosophical system and extracts from the New Testament a systematic body of doctrines. The other plan which is followed by Sanders regards the Christian faith as a historical phenomenon and traces the first stages of its historical development as they are found in the New Testament.

Sanders, in his tracing the development of New Testament doctrine from the teaching of Jesus through Paul, the author of Hebrews and John, concentrates on Christology because he feels that to be absolutely central to New Testament theology. He does not discuss the Epistles ascribed to Peter, John, James and Jude, or the Apocalypse because of the problems of authorship and date connected with them. This book will convince the reader that historical criticism has a real, if limited, validity as applied to the New Testament.

Taylor C. Smith

Christianity and History. By Herbert Butterfield. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950. 146 pages. $2.75.

Butterfield, a British scholar of world repute, reveals in this work his stature as a historian as with humility, insight and perspective he tries to fathom the "colossal comprehensiveness of historical learning." When coupled with a certain outlook on life the power that historical learning may command is "almost frightening." A stark realism, anchored in a vital Christian faith and buttressed by wide and discriminating research, is the main feature of

this work. Butterfield never loses sight of a few basal facts: the height and dignity of persons in the historical process; the cupidity of these self-same persons, high and low, who all too often strut across life's stage in wanton pride, craven fear, smug complacency or starry-eyed idealism.

Butterfield distrusts the self-educated rebel as much as he does the naive statesman who knows only 100 years of history. Due to our modern obsession with man's inherent goodness some of our good men have sold us a number of Messianic hoaxes, i. e., the idea of making the world safe for democracy, war to end all war and the theory that wars are but the result of a few wicked monsters. What does history teach and unfold? Man's universal sinfulness! What is its purpose? The making of souls! Judgment is working itself out in history. Let democracy advocates beware of flattering man overly much! Let modern man heed the voice of the ancient prophets! In the fate of Nazi Germany God has given all nations an object lesson in the mysterious operation of His judgment. Read and ponder! William A. Mueller

P. T. Forsyth: Prophet for Today. By Robert McAfee Brown. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952. 191 pages. $3.50.

Professor Brown of Macalester College in St. Paul has written a very instructive volume on one of England's most influential theologians. Forsyth lived from 1848-1921. An erstwhile liberal, Forsyth experienced in 1893 a turning-point in his theological outlook. His conversion to sound evangelicalism was due to a number of factors: the awareness of the inadequacy of liberalism, the exacting demands of the pastorate, a growing sense of sin and, above all, the work of divine grace in his own heart. Having come into a new and vital understanding of the gospel, Forsyth soon began to exert a rich ministry as a writer and educator. In 1901 he became principal of Hackney College, a congregational seminary, and he remained in this post till his death in 1921. In 1907 he delivered the Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale on "Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind." Two years later, in 1909, appeared his *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ,* one of his best books. In 1913 his biggest work *The Principle of Authority* appeared in print. The year prior to that saw *The Work of Christ,* containing a series of lectures.

The theology of Forsyth was Christo-centric. With the Reformers he gloried in the free and unmerited grace of God revealed in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord. Chapter IV deals with *The Cruciality of the Cross* as Forysyth understood it. It makes exceedingly good reading. Chapter V dealing with *The Lost Note of Authority* may bring light to many a troubled mind. "The seal of authority is the seal of the gospel" (p. 98). Where this truth is known, the authority of both Church and Bible

are properly understood. The gospel both judges and fulfills culture. Yet Christianty is ultimately independent of any political or social scheme or system. This is an informing, wholesome book.

William A. Mueller

Medieval Philosophy. By Frederick C. Copleston. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. 194 pages. $2.75.

It is a false assumption "that one could profitably jump from Plato and Aristotle straight to Francis Bacon and Descartes, omitting all consideration of post-Aristotelian Greek philosophy and of medieval thought" (p. 1). Professor Copleston has written a compact little book on *Medieval Philosophy* in order to offset that error. In twelve chapters the author treats of the origins and character of medieval philosophy, how Islamic and Jewish thought influenced its course, discusses the place of the Universities (Oxford, Paris, Cambridge, Bologna), the Franciscan philosophers (St. Bonaventure, Roger Bacon), the towering St. Thomas Aquinas whose philosophy to this very day is the dominant one in Catholicism, the Averroists or integral Aristotelians (Siger of Brabant and Boethius of Dacia), Duns Scotus, William of Ockham, the speculative mysticism of Nicholas of Cusa and the political philosophy of Marsiglio of Padua.

The conflict between Scotists and Ockhamists regarding universals is carefully traced. Here we see again that the famous medieval synthesis of which we hear so much in these days was beset by many difficulties. In fact, Copleston points out that the thirteenth century knew no one synthesis, but evinced a number of syntheses in the philosophical realm. Nor must we forget that to many orthodox thinkers Thomas Aquinas was quite an innovator in medieval philosophy, in fact, he was, in terms of some of his critics, a sort of modernist . The emergence of speculative mysticism (Cusa, Gerson, Meister Eckhart, John Ruysbroeck) may, according to Copleston, be interpreted only with reservation as a reaction against the wrangling of the schools. For the mystical trend had been present in Christian thought since the days of Augustine.

William A. Mueller

On Proving God. By Roger Hazelton. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 183 pages. $2.50.

In these days when so many religious leaders glory in how irrational they can be in the presentation of Christianity, it is truly refreshing to read a good book on a subject that has been banned from much theological conversation. Healthy Christianity has always given a reason for its faith and faith has been deepened thereby. It remains so today as in all days that there is such a thing as honest doubt, and the Christian theologian that brushes such people aside with a lecture on human pride has displayed as much original

sin as the skeptical seeker. It is a frightful nightmare to think of Christian faith going forth to meet the enemy behind leaders that bless God that they are *berserk*.

Roger Hazelton reveals both sincerity and humility as he explores the reasons for believing in God. To be sure it is not the kind of book that one would use for a series of revival services, but one reads it with the increasing conviction that the Christian evangelist would burn with a brighter light if more of this solid thought undergirded his witness. The demands and the possibility for proof must not be ignored, and the old arguments, even if we are not able to call them proofs, have cogency for those who would clarify personal faith and persuade those who find it difficult to believe in God. *On Proving God* is indeed an excellent "handbook in Christian conversation."

Dale Moody

Essais Sur La Christologie De Saint Jean. By Dom Jacques Dupont. Bruges, Belgium: Editions Le L' Abbaye De Saint-André, 1951. 319 pages. Price not given.

Prof. Dupont, author of *Gnosis* and *Les Problemes du Livre des Acts d'apres les travaux recents*, has added to his scholastic achievements a work that in my opinion is far more significant than his other contributions. The four essays included in this book on the Christology of the Fourth Gospel are Christ the Word, the Light, the Life and the Glory of Christ.

In his discussion of Jesus as Word the author points out that Jesus was not only the bearer of the word of God but the word itself. The intention of the Fourth Gospel writer is not to define the transcendent nature of the Son of God nor determine the manner of his origin in God. The term Logos does not designate the Christ in the manner of a proper or personal name. It is in his relation to the world and to men that Jesus is found to be the Word of God.

The notion of light applied to Jesus is, according to Dupont, practically equivalent to the idea of Messianic salvation. Jesus is the light in his quality of Messiah because he realizes what Isaiah had said about the light which shines to the end of time. Dupont points out further that in the eyes of John the coming of the Son of God on the earth is already a sort of parousia and Christ discovers himself in the exercise of his eschatological prerogatives. The mission which he has received from the Father anticipates that which he will accomplish on the last day. The first coming of Christ is already a manifestation of the eschatological glory.

Taylor C. Smith

Bible Key Words. From Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Worterbuch Zum Neuen Testament. Translated and edited by J. R. Coates. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951. 82 pages. $4.00.

This book contains four monographs from the outstanding *Worterbuch* of Gerhard Kittel and these monographs have been translated in an accurate manner by J. R. Coates. Kittel began this monumental work in 1930 and with the help of the best scholars continued the work until his death in 1948. The *Worterbuch* will be completed even though the editor has died.

The four words from the *Worterbuch* which have been selected by Coates for translation are Love, the Church, Sin, and Righteousness. The article on Love was written by Gottfried Quell and Ethelbert Stauffer and the one on the Church was written by Karl Ludwig Schmidt. Gottfried Quell, Georg Bertram, Gustav Stahlin and Walter Grundmann were contributors for the article on Sin and Gottfried Quell and Gottlob Schrenk were the scholars who wrote on Righteousness.

Other articles from the *Worterbuch* will appear from time to time and it is hoped that it will not be too long before the whole work will have been translated.

Taylor C. Smith

On Being Human. By Ashley Montagu. New York: Henry Schuman, 1950. 122 pages. $2.50.

Montagu, chairman of the Department of Anthroplogy of Rutgers University, presents a convincing argument for the thesis that man and all living things are so constituted that only through cooperation and love are they able to live creatively. Findings from the most advanced researchers in psychology, anthropology, biology and the social sciences are deftly used to buttress the deepest insights of the religious experience of mankind. This means that the still popular idea of Darwin's natural selection and the survival of the fittest needs radical revision.

Montagu believes that the cruel outlook engendered by the industrial revolution helped this biologistic interpretation of life's conflict to lay its grip on millions of folk in the nineteenth century. Prince Kropotkin back in 1902 already indicated that "throughout the realm of living nature . . . an unconscious mutualism which serves to produce greater survival values for every form of life" (p. 25) is at work. Since Lester Ward, Giddings and Drummond a half century of research has tended to confirm the findings of Kropotkin, Driesch, W. M. Wheeler, W. C. Allee, Goldfarb, E. M. Forster and others, all of whom argue in favor of purposive, cooperative, tendencies in man and in nature which make for altruism and mutualism in the long run.

William A. Mueller

The Triple Knowledge, Vol VII: Eating and Drinking Christ. By Herman Hoeksema. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952. 189 pages. $2.50.

The author of this book, a minister of the Reformed Church in America, is writing a multi-volumed exposition of the *Heidelberg Catechism* under the general title of *The Triple Knowledge.* Volume VI was *Baptized into Christ.* The present volume, along with Volume VI, completes the section on the Sacraments. In each volume, Baptism and the Lord's Supper are treated quite properly as theological (as distinguished from merely historical or cultic) concerns.

In covering the *Catechism,* the author automatically deals with the central affirmations of Christian Doctrine. Not least important, intrinsically and in point of contemporary relevance, is the subject of the church and its Sacraments. Faithful exposition is made of the Reformed faith regarding the Supper. The Roman and the Lutheran interpretations are treated less adequately. The book is filled with valuable insights, and is often provocative even where it is not satisfying.

T. D. Price

The Acts of the Apostles. By F. F. Bruce. Chicago: The Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, 1952. 491 pages. Price not given.

Commentaries on The Acts of the Apostles following the English text are not so numerous as commentaries on other books in the New Testament and commentaries on The Acts following the Greek text are even less numerous. Professor F. F. Bruce, head of the Department of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Sheffield, England, has made a great contribution in this work for all students of the New Testament. The first sixty-four pages are devoted to an introduction of The Acts in which he takes into account the recent research of scholars on questions of authorship, sources, style, historical reliability, purpose and plan, Acts in relations to Paul's Epistles, and the text of Acts.

The Greek text on which the commentary is based is that of Westcott and Hort without the critical signs. Professor Bruce departs from the text of Westcott and Hort occasionally. At the conclusion of the introduction the author gives a select bibliography of commentaries, critical editions, works on the text and other literature related directly or indirectly to the Book of Acts.

Taylor C. Smith

Selections from Bayle's Dictionary. Edited by Beller and Lee. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1952. 312 pages. $6.00.

Pierre Bayle, son of a Huguenot minister, lived from 1647 to 1706. A product of a Jesuit College at Toulouse and the University of Geneva, Bayle became a convert to Catholicism only to repudiate

it later. For a time he was professor at the Protestant Seminary at Sedan. When this school was closed by government order in 1681, Bayle, not feeling safe in France, repaired to Rotterdam where he soon obtained a professorship. It was here that he published his famous *Dictionnaire historique et critique* in 1695 of which the present work is a considerably abbreviated form. Bayle's work is not an encyclopaedia in the modern sense, but rather a name lexicon. The author was a versatile man, extremely critical of the various brands of orthodoxy that plagued men in the seventeenth century, and reveals throughout a very sceptical, often satirical vein of writing. This work had a powerful influence upon the philosophers of the eighteenth century and upon men like Thomas Jefferson. The articles on the Anabaptists, Augustin, David, Rémond and Spinoza are of particular interest to historians and students of philosophy.

William A. Mueller

Christ in the Gospels. An Introduction to His Life and Its Meaning. By Henry M. Battenhouse. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1952. 339 pages. $4.00.

The aim of this volume is to unite in as simple a manner as possible four types of study of the Gospels; namely, the quest for a story, the basis of worship, historical analysis, and theological. The author has designed the book for use in the college classroom and hopes that it will be useful for teachers of Bible classes. It is my opinion that he has fulfilled his purpose because there is no book available that could meet the needs of the college classroom as this book can. Teachers of Bible classes in churches will discover that this is the book they have been anxiously awaiting.

The author begins his study of the Gospels with the primitive Christian community which had an oral tradition and not the written gospels. He moves on to the formation of the literature from the oral tradition and discusses form and source criticism. After giving a brief introduction to each gospel Battenhouse devotes the remainder of the book to the life of Jesus.

Taylor C. Smith

The Meaning of Dreams. By Calvin S. Hall. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

The careful reading of Calvin S. Hall's book on the meaning of dreams will rudely awaken the reader even as his own dreams awaken him at times. The theme of Hall's book is that a "skilful man reads his dreams for self-knowledge," and that the insights received from the dreams of normal people are lucid, and not obscure, understandable and not just nonsense. The book is different from a "rehash of Freud and others" in that the author bases his research on countless dreams of relatively normal people with

whom he has participated in their search for a deeper meaning of their own existence. The author records one hundred and eighty-six of these dreams.

The specific contribution that Hall makes is five-fold: (1) He actually records in the words of the counselee an amazing amount of dream material. (2) He lays vital emphasis upon the *series* of dreams as a means of interpretation. "Instead of analyzing each dream separately . . . the dreams of a series are thought of as being a sequence of inter-related events like the chapters of a novel. Each dream contributes something to total picture of the person . . ." (3) He is aware and makes use of the Freudian contribution to dream-theory, but he is not slavishly dependent upon it. (4) He is free of highly technical jargon and his dream series method of interpretation enables him to get at the "plain meaning" of dreams. One does not need to do psychoanalytic gymnastics in the esoteric knowledge of a cult of the "initiated" in order to get the author's meaning. (5) Finally, Hall interprets the dream by the personality as a whole as well as interpreting the personality by the dream. The result is a wholesome, well-balanced approach.

The plan of development of the book begins with a discussion of the nature and content of dreams based upon a "census" of thousands of dreams of which the writer had made a record. The role of sex and aggression in dreams is discussed in a rather orthodox psychoanalytic way. Then the techniques of dream interpretation, followed by a discussion of dream symbolism, are treated. "The Human Triangle" is the title of the next chapter in which it is demonstrated that the Oedipal situation as described by Freud in his study of neurotics is also present in the dream-series of relatively healthy people.

The problems of freedom and security are seen in college students in their search for autonomy of their parental homes, and the problems of moral conflict are seen in the attempts of individuals to bring their instinctual strivings into creative agreement with the common good. The problems of the achievement and clarification of sexual gender and identity as these problems are reflected in conflicts in sex roles, and the problems of advancing age in older people —all these problems are discussed in the light of what dreams of growing people teach us about them.

The whole discussion is summarized in a carefully written chapter on "What Dreams Tell Us About Men." The "androgynous" or bisexual nature of man is set over against commonly accepted cultural separation of the sexes. This thrusts men and women into competition with each other, but more than that—with themselves.

Pastors who cleave to the "surface" psychologies of their college days and to the conventional standards of middle-class Protestant churches will find themselves "taken aback" and even shocked at

what "good people" go to bed and dream about. This book will nettle these pastors either into rethinking their whole view of personality or will cause them to lose their tempers with the ideas expressed in it. Pastors, on the other hand, who re-read their own Bibles and evaluate honestly what is written about the dream life of mankind will take the book as a means to a more prophetic pastoral and preaching ministry. Wayne E. Oates

The Psychology of Religion. By L. W. Grensted. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952. 181 pages.

A refreshing diversion from the American scene of the psychology of religion is brought to the reader of this book, giving a wholly mature and thoroughly scholarly view of the psychology of religion as an Englishman sees it.

Combining the insights of a classical scholar with the enthusiasm of one who eagerly anticipates each new change at the "growing edge" of religious thought and action, Professor Grensted presents a comprehensive evaluation of the historical development and the contemporary scene in the psychology of religion. He even gives a prophetically significant appendix on extra sensory perception! American students in psychology of religion have been so involved in evaluating the importance of the movement for the clinical theological education of ministers that the larger areas of our religious world views have tended to be neglected. This book helps us to correct this neglect. Clinical training of theological students may become a religious "runt" in its development if it is not coupled with an ordered study of religious experience at its best. This book furnishes the pattern for such a study.

I say this because the author is intelligently aware of the problem of the relation between sin and disease and cognizant of the significant contributions of depth psychologists at this point. He gives heavier weight to the importance of Jung at this point than is usually given in America. He is instructive in the numerous ways whereby he points out the limitations of the psychological method in the study of religious reality. This latter is something neophyte theologues who have had one summer of clinical training can profit to know. Especially helpful, also, is it to read a text on the psychology of religion which does not merely parrot what Starbuck, Lenba, James, and Coe had to say at the turn of this century.

However, there are some important omissions of significant research in the book. The author at no point takes into consideration the contribution of Anton T. Boisen to the understanding of conversion and the sense of mission in relation to certain factors in mental illness, especially catatonic schizophrenia. Nor is he aware of the contribution of Harry Stack Sullivan to the science of interpersonal relationships. Likewise, he does not take into con-

sideration the relation of modern physical theory to the shift of emphasis from a biological to a field theory of personality. At this point he is unaware of the contribution of Gardner Murphy. And, too, his sources do not take into account the problems of semantics and communication as they are being integrated into our understanding of religious experience and the ministry of reconciliation. Finally, the contributions of Martin Buber and Paul Tillich are nowhere in evidence in this presentation.

Most noteworthy is the fact that the author of this book is the Nolloth Professor of the Philosophy of Religion at Oxford. The publication of this book by a philosopher of religion parallels that one by David Roberts, also a professor of philosophy of religion, entitled *Psychotherapy and a Christian View of Man.* These two books are indicative of the fact that some of the major issues in the field of the philosophy of religion are being raised by the psychotherapists. When the history of religion of this century is ultimately written, I rather imagine that Christian apologetics will be seen most effectively challenged by psychotherapists.

Wayne E. Oates

Moral Principles of Action. Planned and edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. (Science of Culture Series, Vol. VI.) New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. xii, 720 pages. $7.50.

This is a remarkably excellent work on the moral problems of modern man. Thirty-four of the world's greatest students of ethics have contributed chapters and each has done a notable piece of writing. The book covers the chief areas of ethics and one is pleased to find a certain unity of thought in spite of the differences in cultural, philosophical, and religious backgrounds of the contributors. Here in brief compass one can read Richard Niebuhr's study of "The Center of Value," Eric Fromm's interpretation of "Conscience," Liston Pope's interpretation of the "Social Contexts of Personality," Jacques Maritain's understanding of "Natural Law and Moral Law," Richard McKeon's theory of "International Relations and Morality," M. C. D'Arcy on "Religion and Ethics," James Muilenburg's interpretation of "The Ethics of the Prophet," C. H. Dodd on "The Ethics of the New Testament," Albert Schweitzer's explanation of "He That Loses His Life Shall Find It," and many other enlightening chapters. This book is a "must" for those who lay any claim to understanding contemporary moral problems.

Guy H. Ranson

Mental Affliction and Church Law. By Rev. R. Colin Pickett. Ottawa, Ontario: The University of Ottawa Press, 1952. 220 pages.

This volume is particularly helpful in giving an understanding of the Catholic position on the care of the mentally ill. It

deals with the problem historically as it appears in the codified laws of the Church. In the main, the weight of the law is in the direction of the protection of the patient. He is predominantly considered as the law would consider a child, which is a curious affirmation of psychological findings concerning mental illness as a regression to child-like states. However, a consistent, conscious faculty psychology prevails throughout, and man is seen as being less than human when he is mentally ill. Ethically, such a psychology is untenable. In the light of contemporary gestalt psychology, a "faculty" concept of personality is hopelessly outmoded.

Nevertheless, the Baptist minister who reads such a treatise as this will know better how to deal with legalistic formulations with his own flock. Likewise, he will appreciate the fact that the Catholic law demands a clergy that is sound of mind and has the necessary legal methodology for assuring this, to say the least. But those of us who have read Zilbourg's *History of Medical Psychology* and *Malleus Maleficarum* make careful notes of the fact that the Inquisitional instruments for dealing with witches and sorcerers are strangely absent in this treatise.

Wayne E. Oates

Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette. By Nolen B. Harmon. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1950. 215 pages. $2.50.

Since its publication in 1928, *Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette* has served as an authoritative standard in its field. The revised edition is even more valuable.

In enlarging the book, Dr. Harmon has had the counsel of eighty-six prominent ministers, representing different denominations in different areas of the country. As nearly as can be done, commonly accepted ideals of ministerial ethics and etiquette are set forth.

The book discusses such subjects as the personal life of the minister, his relationship with fellow ministers and his denomination, the conduct of public worship, the marriage service, funeral service, proper ministerial dress. In brief, the book answers almost every question of ministerial ethics which may arise.

The writer urges each student in his classes to buy this book for his library. It is the kind of reference book which every pastor should have.

V. L. Stanfield

Strengthened With Might. By Harold Wilkie. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1952. 95 pages. $1.50.

The spiritual pilgrimage of persons with organic differences from the majority of their fellow human beings is made vividly real to the reader of this book. The author, a minister of an Evan-

gelical and Reformed Church, is different himself in that he was born without his arms. In a very wholesome way, therefore, the book is autobiographical. However, it is autobiographical in the best sense, i.e., the author reveals his own experience incidental to the main theme of the book which is to give hope, guidance, and concrete suggestions to persons who have some permanent impairment of their bodies to bear. Pastors and families of physically handicapped persons will find this book to be an effective pastoral aid in counseling with them.

The great quaternity of subtle forces that undermine the handicapped person's competency as an individual spirit are set forth: (1) He must discover a way of having those who are close to him—family and friends—to know that he need not necessarily be denied a useful life. (2) He must learn to handle the frustration and loneliness occasioned by his handicap. (3) He must avoid the temptation to "use" his infirmity to gain special favors from others. (4) He must face forthrightly his suspicions and hostilities as they may hinder his interpersonal relationships with others.

Having looked inward, he finds the solution to these problems by looking outward in the discovery of a sense of mission in the world and by looking upward to find resources in the worship and praise of God.

Wayne E. Oates

More Power for Your Church. By Willard A. Pleuthner. New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1952. 408 pages. $3.75.

Many ministers have on their desks Mr. Pleuthner's first book, *Building Up Your Congregation.* Even more valuable is this new volume, which contains "proven plans and projects" brought together by the author with the assistance of hundreds of ministers and church workers. The pastor, on opening the book, will perhaps be embarrassed by the sense of having more wealth than he knows what to do with. New ideas, plans, projects, promotional schemes, attractive programs, administrative devices, money raising methods, time saving suggestions, educational methods, ways of worship, fellowship and recreational resources, community survey and service techniques, evangelistic enterprises, and on and on, stimulate and intrigue the reader.

If any area of church activity has been left out, this reviewer has failed to notice it. Perhaps the title might have been more accurately, *More Projects for Your Church,* for the reaction of the pastor may well be, here is the machinery—but where is the power? Doubtless it would be asking too much of such a book to furnish the power; that must come through a Spirit-led and Spirit-filled pastor and people. The pastor who does not have this book at hand will defraud himself and his church.

G. S. Dobbins

In Quest of God's Power. By Charles L. Allen. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1953. 191 pages. $2.50.

The pastor of Grace Methodist Church, Atlanta, is known beyond the bounds of his city as an unusual preacher and pastor. This book of sermon-meditations discloses the secret of his power and popularity. He lives with people, he helps people to understand themselves and to solve their problems, he combines the use of the Bible with sound counseling techniques. He tells the story of coming to this great city church with a sense of utter inadequacy; of how, kneeling in the empty church at the altar, a great peace came into his heart; and how thereafter at the close of each Sunday evening service the "altar call" is given, bringing hundreds to their knees for an experience similar to his. The meditations are full of human interest experiences that illustrate biblical truths. Such life problems are dealt with as "the person you can be," "handicaps need not handicap," "the big question of forgiveness," "faith can heal," "why we worry," "are you lonely?" "taking the fear out of death."

G. S. Dobbins

Principles of Personality Building for Christian Parents. By C. B. Eavey. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1952. 321 pages. $3.75.

It is refreshing to read a book on personality development written from a Christian point of view. This book is certainly not an exhaustive treatise on any one phase of personality but is a simple, well-written, interesting presentation of selected facts and ideas with the Bible as the ultimate and final criterion.

Doctor Eavey has written other books on principles of teaching, and this one recognizes the importance of the home in the religious education of children. It offers sound advice for Christian parents and teachers in their responsible positions in molding the characters and personalities of the children. The first four chapters deal with the family and the responsibilities of parents, and the following ones treat such subjects as security, independence, authority, fear, anger, love, inferiority, etc.

This book may well be used as a text book for study in colleges or seminaries, in church school classes; as a guidebook for teachers of children; and as a help for parents in the guidance of their children. It is decidedly weak on case history materials, but it is obvious that the author has used many such materials in the establishing of his principles. A very valuable and extensive list of questions follow each chapter, and the bibliography alone is worth the price of the book.

Denton Coker

Elementary School Guidance. By Ervin Winfred and Mary Ford Detzen. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952. 266 pages. $3.75.

Those of us in the field of education in Kentucky are especially proud of this volume, the joint product of the principals of the Gavin H. Cochran School and the Alex G. Barrett Junior High School, Louisville. The authors state that the book is written for all teachers—"experienced, inexperienced, and prospective—who are interested in improving the mental health of children." Its viewpoint is that of the child-centered school program as over against the old content-centered, teacher-minded, discipline-motivated school.

The authors know children and they also know education. They realize out of experience how tragic are the mistakes made because the deep-seated needs of children are so often ignored and unmet. The book is more than a text—it is guidance for teachers, parents, social workers, religious leaders, and all others who deal with child life. The materials are intended for study through at least a year of concentrated concern for a better program of elementary education in which responsible persons representing the entire community will ideally take part. With keen insight the authors help us to understand the present-day child and to deal with his difficult problems of growing up.

This book should be made available for all elementary workers who take their responsibilities seriously. G. S. Dobbins

Readings in American Educational History. By Edgar W. Knight and Clifton L. Hall. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951. 781 pages. $5.00.

A collection of original documents is a rare and desirable contribution to its respective field. This book is a collection of documents of American educational and social history. It is an attempt to make available to students of educational history primary sources for study and investigation. The documents brought together begin with those on Henrico College and the East India School in Virginia in the early part of the seventeenth century and continue into 1950.

A good sign of our day is the general recognition that a field of study cannot be mastered from a study of textbooks or secondary sources alone, but that primary sources only represent the ultimate in intellectual pursuit. This book makes it possible for students in the history of education in the United States to have this opportunity.

Of course the book is limited in the number of documents that could be included, and every reader who is a student of American educational history will wonder why certain ones have been omitted. Nevertheless many good ones have been included which illustrate

the persistence of problems in education which run far back into the past. This volume should be especially helpful to those interested in educational administration and supervision on all levels, the education of teachers, federal relations in education, educational practices, and the very vital issue of the relationship between Church and State in education.

Denton Coker

The Hope of Glory. By John Seville Higgins. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Company, 1953. 143 pages. $2.25.

A student startled his professor by asking, "Who wrote the Book of Common Prayer?" Origins of the "Prayer Book" are of course hidden in antiquity. One of the prayers most widely known and used among Anglicans is "A General Thanksgiving." It is indeed a model of conciseness and comprehensiveness. It is attributed to Edward Reynolds, Bishop of Norwich, 1661-1676. Dr. Higgins, rector of St. Martin's Church, Providence, Rhode Island, recently elected Bishop Coadjutor of Rhode Island, has developed this series of meditations by the simple devise of using a sentence from the "General Thanksgiving" as the topic. Each topic is stated in unusual fashion and the discussion given a turn that makes it strikingly relevant to present thought and need. For instance, he goes from God as "The King of Creation" to "The Creator's Care," on to "The Lower Levels of Praise," through "The Means of Grace," to "The Power of an Integrated Life." A great deal of appropriate scripture is interwoven. The book will prove especially useful in the preparation of worship services.

G. S. Dobbins

Alcuin, Friend of Charlemagne. By Eleanor Shipley Duckett. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. 312 pages. $5.00.

For the first time in thirty years a new full-length biography of Alcuin, the great educator and leader at the court of Charlemagne, has been published in English. The subject is one whose name both deserves and needs to be kept before the world to whom he made so great a contribution. It has been well said, "From 782 till Alcuin's death in 804 there is hardly a diplomatic act of the great King, Charlemagne, hardly a controversy in the Church, hardly a project of social reorganization and no plan of educational reform in what was to become the Holy Roman Empire, on which the English scholar Alcuin did not leave the impress of his personality."

Miss Duckett is well qualified to undertake the tremendous task of writing a biography of a man whose letters, three hundred of which remain, are all written in Latin and are inaccessible in any complete translation into English. She was born in England where she received the B. A. degree with Honors in English and the

M. A. in Greek and Latin at Girton College of the University of Cambridge. She received the D. Lit. from the University of London and the Ph.D. at Bryn Mawr in America. At present she is the John M. Greene Professor of Classics emeritus at Smith College where she taught for many years.

The book is a real work of scholarship. Miss Duckett goes very much into detail to describe the life of this important figure both in Anglo-Saxon England and on the continent of Europe. In fact if there is any criticism made of the book it would be by the one who is not interested in historic details of the life and times in which Alcuin lived. One of the most commendable features of this work is the splendid documentation and the extensive use of footnotes, providing guidance for those who might wish to study the original letters and writings. This work will certainly be of value to students of history, theology, education, and literature as well as the general reader.

Denton Coker

Why I Became A Priest. Edited by Rev. George L. Kane. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1952. 163 pages. $1.00.

Why do Roman Catholic ministers enter the priesthood? To most of us the answer is not clear. We are familiar with the doctrine and experience of "the call" of Protestant ministers. Is there an essential difference in the case of Catholic priests?

Ten outstanding Catholic clerics throw light on the question from a variety of viewpoints. The reader receives a number of striking impressions—that these men are thoroughly and wholesomely human, that they know how to tell their story, that they are convinced of the greatness of their calling and the validity of their faith. Whether or not they are representative, the priests of this book believe themselves to be called of God, they write as men with a mission, fully devoted to a cause worthy of their best. Much light is thrown on the crusading spirit of the Catholic Church in America by these biographical sketches. This book is worth reading for many reasons.

G. S. Dobbins

Adolescent Character and Personality. By Robert J. Havighurst and Hilda Taba. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949. 311 pages. $4.00.

In the last decade an increasing number of scientists, educators, and psychologists have become interested in seeking a scientific approach to the problem of the development of moral character. This book is an outstanding contribution to this field of study. It is a report of a series of studies made on all youths who were 16 years old in 1942 in "Prarie City." The investigation was conducted by the Committee on Human Development of the University of Chicago

composed of members from various departments relating to the development of children and adults: biology, physiology, nutrition, pediatrics, psychiatry, anthropology, sociology, education, and psychology.

In making these studies the Committee used a variety of sociological and psychological techniques, administered by specialists in their various fields. Robert J. Havighurst gave it general direction along with his associate Hilda Taba. Mr. Havighurst received his Ph.D. at Ohio State University and has served in many distinguished places during his life. Since 1941 he has been Professsor of Education and Secretary of the Committee on Human Development at the University of Chicago. Miss Taba received her Ph.D. at Teachers College, Columbia University and is now Director of the Center for the Study of Intergroup Education, University of Chicago.

This report is a very outstanding contribution to the field of human development. It describes in detail the character, personality, social environment, and the relationships between them of a number of young people in a real midwestern town. It will be of interest to schoolmen, churchmen, parents, and all others interested in character development.

Denton Coker

Church Work in the City. By Frederick A. Shippey. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952. 255 pages. $4.50.

The author of this worthy book is director of research and surveys, Department of City Work, Board of Missions and Church, and has been visiting lecturer on the urban church at Drew University since 1950.

In eight provocative chapters Dr. Shippey comes to grips with the perplexing problems stemming from the current urban revolution in America. He shows how urban church strategy must be undergirded with sociological facts and presents tested techniques and proven procedures which any urban pastor can adapt to community needs.

Since this book is one of the most adequate studies of its kind, urban pastors, city missionaries, and teachers of urban sociology will find this book to be based upon the solid findings of sociology and a useful instrument for implementing urban church strategy.

Henlee Barnette

Making Your Marriage Succeed. By Theodore F. Adams. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. 156 pages. $2.00.

As a Christian minister, the author of this charming volume has had wide experience in marriage and family counseling. This book reflects the warm heart of a noble pastor and the critical intelligence of a student of human relationships.

Though the chapters are sermonic in nature, the messages are filled with sociological facts so essential to an adequate understanding of the meaning of marriage and family living. But in the main, the book articulates the Christian basis for love and marriage.

Here is a book on courtship and marriage that the pastor can proudly present to his young people as a graduation or wedding gift. It will also be invaluable to those who are finding it difficult to make a success of their marriage relationship.

Henlee Barnette

Modern Poetry and the Christian Tradition: A Study in the Relations of Christianity and Culture. By Amos N. Wilder. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952. 287 pages. $3.00.

Winner of the decennial prize of the Bross Foundation, Lake Forest College, this volume is an interpretation of the significance of modern poetry and its relation to the Christian faith. Dr. Wilder is Professor of New Testament Interpretation at the Chicago Theological Seminary. He is thoroughly qualified to discuss both poetry and religion, as is clearly demonstrated in this study.

Poets often see more clearly and express more vividly the underlying issues of our historical existence. For example, poets of the last fifty years have sometimes given a more accurate picture of the crisis of our age than some theologians. Among these poets are Tate, Auden and Eliot, samples of whose poetry are used in this book to illustrate the characteristics of our civilization.

Here is a clear and challenging diagnosis of the deeper, spiritual and moral undercurrents of our time. As an incisive analysis of Christianity and contemporary culture, this is one of the most stimulating and persuasive documents of its kind that the reviewer has read.

Henlee Barnette

Speech: Its Techniques and Disciplines in a Free Society. By W. Norwood Brigance. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952. 582 pages. $4.00.

Ever so often a book appears in one's field of specialization with such outstanding characteristics that the reviewer is constrained to remark, "I should like to have written this one!" To one who believes that speech is both academically respectable "art-discipline" and a science of no mean proportions, Brigance's textbook is a fitting addition to the student-speaker's shelf marked "Exhibit A." It is not a volume that can be absorbed in one easy reading, or mastered in ten easy lessons. This does not mean that the book is not easy to read; rather, the style is quite personal, and the choice of words is appropriate.

Concentrating on public speaking and rhetoric as a major phase of speech, the author presents a stimulating procedure in speech-

making. His seven lamps "to guide those who would speak to influence public opinion" comprise perhaps the most significant discussion of how-to-go-about-it since Alan Monroe's five steps for a motivated sequence appeared in *Principles and Tyes of Speech.*

Charles A. McGlon

With Christ After the Lost. By L. R. Scarborough, revised by E. D. Head. Nashville: The Broadman Press, 1953. 291 pages. $3.00.

When this book in its original form came out some twenty years ago Dr. Scarborough was at the height of his power as evangelist and as teacher of evangelism in Southwestern Theological Seminary. Dr. Head succeeded not only to the presidency but to the professorship of evangelism. In his use of Dr. Scarborough's book, Dr. Head found that it needed considerable revision. The changes made have given the book freshness and greater teachability. Even those who have the old book will welcome the new edition and all who aspire to be winners of souls should add this "sword of the spirit" to their equipment. No book on evangelism has ever had quite so much usable scripture materials.

G. S. Dobbins

Queen Without a Crown. By Loyd E. Williams. San Antonio, Texas: The Naylor Company, 1952. 95 pages. $2.50.

Here is not literary masterpiece, but a warm, human story in which the pastor's wife is the heroine. Her story is told by her minister-husband, with refreshing frankness and sympathy. A distinctive feature for a book of this kind is the absence of criticism of the church and church members. The pastor and his courageous and sensible wife had their share of hardships but they were more than compensated for by their joys and rewards. The story will pull at your heart strings.

G. S. Dobbins

Building Church Membership Through Evangelism. By Dawson C. Bryan. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952. 188 pages. $2.00.

Out of a rich experience in evangelism, Dawson C. Bryan writes in this book a very challenging and practical approach to the winning of people to Christ. Its contribution lies in its specific and practical restatement of tried and proven principles of visitation evangelism. Especially valuable are his lectures for training people to visit and win others to Christ. This book will be a valuable addition to every soul winner's library, and is an excellent guidebook for the minister to use as he seeks to develop an evangelistic congregation.

Denton Coker

The Practice of Evangelism. By Bryan Green. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951. 258 pages. $3.00.

From the pen of the Rector of Birmingham, England, comes an excellent work on the theory and practice of evangelism. This is one of the most stimulating and thought provoking statements of its kind. The author seeks to awaken Christians to their responsibility of winning others to Christ: "Some who profess to follow the Master exhibit no active interest in the missionary task of the Church nor any zeal to win others to Christian discipleship."

Mr. Green seems to have a remarkable understanding of the whole task of evangelism as it relates to the work of the church. He says, "It is clear that the Church only fulfills its function as the Body of Christ if it is constantly thinking how those who are outside are to be won inside." He follows his discussion of the meaning of evangelism with practical suggestions on methods, steps in training others, and publicity in evangelistic endeavors.

In a few places the reader has to take into account the religious background of the author, but as a whole this book is one of the finest contributions to an understanding of the New Testament concept of evangelism produced in our day.

Denton Coker

Treasury of Stewardship Illustrations. By Basil Miller. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1952. 192 pages. $2.00.

From many sources Dr. Miller has drawn illustrative material bearing on the doctrine and practice of Christian stewardship. The stories, anecdotes, experiences, testimonials, biographical sketches, historical allusions, and the like are organized in seven parts—the Christian stewardship of self, of time, of prayer, of giving, of money, of tithing, with a closing section made up of Christian stewardship slogans and quotes. Some of the illustrations are lacking in freshness and vitality, but many are relevant and helpful. The preacher preparing a series of stewardship sermons or talks will do well to secure this storehouse of helps.

G. S. Dobbins

The Great Enterprise: Relating Ourselves to Our World. By H. A. Overstreet. New York: W. W. Norton, 1952. 332 pages. $3.50.

The author of *The Mature Mind,* (which has gone through its 20th printing) comes to our assistance now with the great adventure of establishing effective interpersonal relationships to our world. The achievement of an adequate self-hood is the equipment for the adventure, and the self in the world is the challenging arena of the adventure. Professor Overstreet is adequately informed with the latest research in the field of the psychosocial sciences, and is amazingly alert to the developments in the institutions and movements of peoples around the world.

The pastor will do well to get the refreshing evaluations of what a church *can* be in the modern world, as well as this non-theological interpreter's view of Jesus as a person. A careful reading of this book will aid a minister in his prophetic task of preaching and deepen his sensitivity to the basic person-hood of his people.

Wayne E. Oates

Two Vital Questions. By William Postell Witsell. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1952. 172 pages. $2.50.

A thoughtful Episcopal minister undertakes to answer two of the most persistent questions on the lips of men today: *why pray* and *after death—what?* The answers are derived in part from the scriptures, in part from philosophy, and in part from reason and experiences. The last mentioned approach is the one given the greater emphasis. In the main, the author follows fairly familar lines of argument except in the chapters on "Paradise." Distinguishing "paradise" from "heaven," Dr. Witsell expounds a modified doctrine of purgatory, seeking to prove that there is growth and activity after death until the soul is prepared for its final abode. He makes use of a number of proof texts and adduces some interesting if not always convincing reasons for the "intermediate state." On the whole, the book contains much material of devotional value.

G. S. Dobbins

Biblical Demonology—A Study of the Spiritual Forces Behind the Present World Unrest. By Merrill F. Unger. Wheaton: Van Kampen Press, 1952. 250 pages. $4.00.

The author of this book would have made a greater contribution to the study of demons if he had not been obsessed with the idea of ultra-conservatism for ultra-convervatism's sake. From the documentation it is very evident that Unger is aware of the best books on demonology. However, he limits himself by the statement "the Book of Genesis . . . contains all the elements requisite for the development of a demonology analogous to that of the New Testament" p. 17. Unger could never prove that statement. He further errs in saying that biblical demonolgy in its elemental form in the earlier chapters of Genesis is the ultimate source and basis of all demonology whether it be ethic, later Biblical, Jewish and Christian.

Unger has added nothing to the study of demons that was not already presented by Langton in his book *Essentials of Demonology.*

Taylor C. Smith

Child Adoption in the Modern World. By Margaret Kornitzer. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. $4.50.

A British expert on child welfare reveals a detailed and comprehensive picture of the problems involved in child adoption. The

finding of "childless homes for homeless children" (and vice versa) often becomes the privilege of the pastor, in that in small communities the pastor has to function in the absence of a social worker. Kornitzer effectively demonstrates the hazards of a sentimental approach to the dependent and neglected child's needs without at the same time becoming cold-blooded about it all. The pastor will do well to suggest this book to familes who are considering adopting a child.

Wayne E. Oates

Have Faith in God. By Samuel Martin Miller. Rock Island, Illinois: Augusta Book Concern, 1952. 156 pages. $2.00.

Prayer is an inexhaustible subject. "There are many things that Jesus challenges his followers to do, but above all, it seems to me, he urges us to pray and in praying to have faith in God . . . in this book I am seeking to share with my fellow pilgrims through this world of sin and its attending problems some of the prayer truths which I have learned in the study of the Bible and in the practice of prayer." In the fifty-two devotional meditations which comprise this brief volume, almost every phase of prayer is touched on. The author is the founder and former dean of Lutheran Bible Institute, Minneapolis. A year spent with these meditations (one a week) would deepen the spiritual life of any group.

G. S. Dobbins

Teaching the Way. By Donald F. Irvin. Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1952. 144 pages. $2.00.

Since the days of Luther, Lutheran pastors have sought to give catechetical instruction to their catechumens. In former times the catechism was simply memorized and recited as a requirement leading to confirmation. Modern education has cast much doubt on the value of the catechism thus used. Effective teaching, whether in religion or any other subject, can best be carried on in a life situation. This book is an effort to provide a plan for teaching Lutheranism, including the catechism, in accordance with sound psychological principles. The result is a text book that is bright, chatty, thought provoking, stimulating to presentation on the part of the pupil. The formula for conducting each of the several class sessions runs thus: (1) What is the catechism? (2) What does the Bible teach us? (3) What does Luther say about it? (4) What do you say? Portions of the catechism are printed and directions are provided for student activity. Pastors who teach classes for new church members will find in this book many helpful suggestions.

G. S. Dobbins

Seventy-seven Parable Talks for Young Folks. By John Henry Sargent. Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1952. 164 pages. $2.00.

Here is a helpful book for preachers, teachers, parents, and all others who live or work with juniors and younger intermediates. The author deals with such familiar things as clocks, eggs, hinges, mirrors, pumps, and many others, and uses them to impress, clearly and firmly, Christian teaching applicable to life. These are not object lessons but parables, and the material is presented in a fresh and interesting manner sure to appeal to these age groups.

Sabin P. Landry, Jr.

Tomorrow Is Yours. By Orva Lee Ice. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953. 153 pages. $2.00.

In the twenty brief talks contained in this volume, Dr. Ice shows a keen awareness of the type of thinking and living which youth is disposed to adopt in the secularistic and materialistic environment of today's world. In a simple and straightforward manner, he presents the challenge of the Christian way and indicates its present-day application in the lives of young people. These effective messages should be helpful to all who work and talk with young people.

Sabin P. Landry, Jr.

Forty Days with Jesus. By M. E. Willcockson. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1952. 112 pages.

Certain great experiences in the earthly ministry of Jesus as recorded in the gospels are the bases for the forty-six devotional readings in this small book. The readings have been arranged for use especially during the Lenten season, but the book may be used profitably at any time of the year. The events related are not confined to those of the last days of Jesus' life on earth, nor are they arranged chronologically. The weekly hymn and mealtime prayer provided for use during each of the seven weeks' devotional material are excellent aids to family worship.

Sabin P. Landry, Jr.

Enardo and Rosael. By Alejandro Tapia y Rivera. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1952. 56 pages. $2.75.

An allegorical novella, describing the love, in ancient Greece, the Middle Ages and the nineteenth century respectively, of two angelic beings in earthly form. Its motif is the transformation and transcendence of earthly by spiritual love, or the victory of spirit over flesh. Both science and art need faith.

Senor Tapia is accounted by some the greatest of the Puerto Rican literati. This interesting and penetrating idyl is translated by the author's son.

T. D. Price

A History of Baptists in Kentucky. By Frank M. Masters. Kentucky Baptist Historical Society, 127 East Broadway, Louisville, Kentucky, 1953. $4.95.

This book covers the early period of Kentucky Baptist history, 1769-1885, covered by J. H. Spencer in his two-volume book entitled *A History of Kentucky Baptists,* now out of print, although it has to be abbreviated. Then for the period from 1885 through 1949 this is the only work now available which covers all the period for all phases of the work in Kentucky. Because of extensive revision and indexing, the publication of this book has been delayed until now. The book has a total of 645 pages, with 41 pages of index which makes the book far more useful. It is printed on good paper, the pages have a nice appearance, and the book is durably bound.

Dr. Masters, the author, has been associated with Baptist work in Kentucky for many years. He has been pastor, college administrator and writer, having prepared a "History of Ohio Valley Baptist Association of Kentucky," and a "History of Bethel Association of Kentucky."

Leo T. Crismon

The Pauline Eschatology. By Geerhardus Vos. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952. 365 pages. $5.00.

For forty years Geerhardus Vos was professor of Biblical Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary and this work is perhaps his greatest contribution to theological scholarship. This book was probably more valuable when it was first published since the author was attacking rationalism eschatology but new eschatological ideas have come into the limelight since then which would take away some of the value of the book.

Taylor C. Smith

Basic Questions About Christian Behavior. By Leonard Greenway. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 2nd ed., 1949. 114 pages. $1.50.

This book should be useful in introducing some of the questions of Christian ethics to boys and girls. Mr. Greenway attempts to present the bearing of the Bible upon contemporary problems of personal and social behavior, and in part he achieves his goal in spite of his tendency to a rigid biblicism on the one hand and a rather shallow understanding of the complexity of contemporary society on the other.

Guy H. Ranson

The Family Scrapbook. By Ernest G. Osborne. New York: Association Press, 1951. 457 pages. $3.95.

It is one thing to possess a knowledge of child psychology, and it is another to be able to translate that knowledge into workable practical activities. Ernest Osborne, Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, has done this in his book. Among the many suggestions he makes for happy, harmonious family relationships religious training for the child is not omitted. He points out that the child may be expected to reach a period when it is normal for him to question religion. He offers many interesting suggestions for activities which may be used to implement the sound psychological principles of child development he suggests.

This is a book which every minister will want to have available to recommend to parents as they begin their families. It should be in every church library. Its more than four hundred lively, illustrated talks with parents show how parents, children, daily activities and problems, and the home can be blended together to make lots of happiness for every member of the family.

Denton Coker

A Practical Guide For Troubled People. By Lee R. Steiner New York: Greenberg, Publisher, 1952. 299 pages. $3.50.

The title of this book is misleading in that it leaves the impression of being a self-help book for persons in trouble. In reality it is an excellent guide for a pastor to use himself in leading his people to competent professional counselors and in protecting them from quacks, charlatans and racketeers in the fields of help for confused people. The author has done careful research, written in an almost newspaper style, and furnished us with a sane point of view. It will be especially helpful for ministers working in large metropolitan cities.

Wayne E. Oates

Comfort For Christians. By Arthur W. Pink. Swengel, Pennsylvania: Bible Truth Depot, 1952. $1.75.

Here are twenty-seven unusually timely and satisfying devotional studies. Each topic gathers about a great verse of scripture, and is unfolded with penetrating insight. Especially useful and helpful are the meditations based on the eighth chapter of Romans and the Beatitudes. Those charged with responsibility for worship programs will find in this volume a wealth of suggestive and usable materials. Contents of the book have appeared from time to time in magazine form.

G. S. Dobbins

Hearts Afire. By Vance Havner. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1952. 160 pages. $2.00.

Vance Havner is an evangelist who combines thought with feeling. The twenty-one chapters of the book obviously represent the best of the evangelist's sermons. No particular theme binds the sermons together—they are topical and textual as indicated by such subjects as "The Christ of Experience;" "God's Cure for Ignorance;" "From Ruin to Redemption;" "The Victory of the Violent;" "Pattern for Perilous Times." The sermons are contemporary, bright, fervent, evangelistic in the best sense.

G. S. Dobbins

Oral Communication of Literature. By Gail Boardman. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1952. 472 pages. $4.95.

This is a text now used in our basic course in Oral Interpretation of the Scriptures. The author is a clear lively writer. The chapters on *Gaining the Impression* and *Planning Interpretation* can be very valuable to a preacher who desires to improve his oral reading of the scriptures or his sensitivity to words in his delivery of the sermon

Books Reviewed In This Issue

AUTHOR TITLE	PAGE
Adams, Theodore F.: Making Your Marriage Succeed	382
Allen, Charles L.: In Quest of God's Power	378
Anshen, Ruth Nanda (ed.): Moral Principles of Action	375
Battenhouse, Henry M.: Christ in the Gospels	372
Beller and Lee (eds.): Selections from Bayle's Dictionary	371
Boardman, Gail: Oral Communication of Literature	391
Brigance, W. Norwood: Speech: Its Techniques and Disciplines in a Free Society	383
Brown, Robert McAfee: P. T. Forsyth: Prophet for Today	367
Bruce, F. F.: The Acts of the Apostles	371
Bryan, Dawson C.: Building Church Membership Through Evangelism	384
Butterfield, Herbert: Christianity and History	366
Coates, J. R.: Bible Key Words	370
Copleston, Frederick C.: Medieval Philosophy	360
Duckett, Eleanor S.: Alcuin, Friend of Charlemagne	380
Dupont, Dom Jacques: Essais Sur La Christologie De Saint Jean	369
Eavey, C. B.: Principles of Personality Building for Christian Parents	378
Ferm, Vergilius: The American Church of the Protestant Heritage	365
Green, Bryan: The Practice of Evangelism	385
Greenway, Leonard: Basic Questions About Christian Behavior	389
Grensted, L. W.: The Psychology of Religion	374
Hall, Calvin S.: The Meaning of Dreams	372
Harmon, Nolen B.: Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette	376
Havighurst and Taba: Adolescent Character and Personality	381
Havner, Vance: Hearts Afire	391
Hazelton, Roger: On Proving God	368
Higgins, John Seville: The Hope of Glory	380
Hoeksema, Herman: The Triple Knowledge, Vol. VII: Eating and Drinking Christ	371
Ice, Orva Lee: Tomorrow Is Yours	388
Irvin, Donald C.: Teaching the Way	387
Kane, George L. (ed.): Why I Became A Priest	381
Knight and Hall: Readings in American Educational History	379
Kornitzer, Margaret: Child Adoption in the Modern World	386
Masters, Frank M.: A History of Baptists in Kentucky	389
Miller, Basil: Treasury of Stewardship Illustrations	385
Miller, Samuel Martin: Have Faith in God	387
Montagu, Ashley: On Being Human	370
Osborne, Ernest G.: The Family Scrapbook	390
Oulton, J. E. L.: Holy Communion and Holy Spirit	364
Overstreet, H. A.: The Great Enterprise: Relating Ourselves to Our World	385
Pickett, R. Colin: Mental Affliction and Church Law	375
Pink, Arthur W.: Comfort for Christians	390
Pleuthner, Willard A.: More Power for Your Church	377
Rivea, Alejandro Tapiay: Enardo and Rosael	388

AUTHOR	TITLE	PAGE
Sanders, J. N.:	The Foundations of the Christian Faith	366
Sargent, John Henry:	Seventy-seven Parable Talks for Young Folks	388
Scarborough, L. R.:	With Christ After the Lost	384
Shippey, Frederick A.:	Church Work in the City	382
Stace, W. T.:	Time and Eternity	361
Steiner, Lee R.:	A Practical Guide for Troubled People	390
Unger, Merrill F.:	Biblical Demonology—A Study of the Spiritual Forces Behind the Present World Unrest	386
Vos, Geerhardus:	The Pauline Eschatology	389
Weiss, Paul:	Man's Freedom	362
Wilder, Amos N.:	Modern Poetry and the Christian Tradition: A Study in the Relations of Christianity and Culture	383
Wilkie, Harold:	Strengthened with Might	376
Willcockson, M. E.:	Forty Days with Jesus	388
Williams, Loyd E.:	Queen Without a Crown	384
Winfred and Detzen, (ed.):	Elementary School Guidance	379
Witsell, William P.:	Two vital Questions	386
Woolf, Bertram Lee (Translator):	Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, Vol. I; The Basis of the Protestant Reformation	363